THE WAYS
ܟܠ [illegible] ܘܟܠ [illegible]

AND MEANS OF THE DIVINE ECONOMY

An Edition, Translation
and Study of Six Biblical
Homilies by Narsai

Judith Frishman

AuC: 1412/1995

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek
Halle
Zweigbibl.
Ha 1
Vorderer Orient

Stellingen

behorende bij het proefschrift
The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy
An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai
van Judith Frishman, 2 juni 1992

I

Hainthaler's opinion (A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/4, Freiburg, 1990, 152) that the Nestorianism of Cosmas Indicopleustes is far removed from that of Narsai is incorrect (see this thesis).

II

Išo'dad of Merv is not only less limited than Theodore of Mopsuestia in his recognition of messianic prophecies in the Old Testament (C. Van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament*, IV. *Isaïe et les Douze*, Louvain, 1969, transl., pref., I-VII), he also tends to eliminate historical interpretations in favor of typological ones in his commentary on the New Testament as opposed to his commentary on the Old Testament when the same passages are involved, e.g. Ex. 25 and Heb. 9.

III

As opposed to Macomber's supposition (W.F. Macomber, *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa*, Louvain, 1974, transl., XVII) a parallel to the passage in which Cyrus of Edessa denies that the Eucharist really is Christ's body and blood (*ibid.*, text, 49) may be found in the surviving remnants of Theodore of Mopsuestia's works (R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse, *Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, Vatican City, 1949, 474, fol. 119v,5-17. Cf. 474-480, fol. 119v,17-121r,4).

IV

The column and the snake in Rembrandt's painting "A Man in Oriental Costume" (1639, Chatsworth, Duke of Devonshire Collection) may not only refer to the brazen serpent in the desert (Nu. 11) but also to the serpent, tree and death sentence of Paradise. The parallels drawn by Ephrem (*Hymnen De Paradiso* III,14, XII,4 and XV,9.10) between the two kings - Adam and Uzziah - who unlawfully entered the Holy of Holies to snatch that which was not theirs - the fruit and the priesthood - and were struck - being stripped of glory or becoming leprous - may strengthen the arguments in favor of the identification of the figure in the painting with Uzziah (Eisler and Schwartz) as opposed to Moses (Hofstede de Groot), Aaron (Bauch) or Dan (Tümpel).

V

The arguments of Avi-Yonah ("The Mosaics of Mopsuestia - Church or Synagogue?", in L. Levine, ed., *Ancient Synagogue Revealed*, Jerusalem, 1981, 186-190) in favor of considering the 4th c. mosaic floor discovered in Mopsuestia (see the cover of this thesis) as belonging to a synagogue as opposed to a church are unconvincing. The importance of Noah in 4-5th c. Christian exegesis substantiates Budde's original identification of the site as a church (L. Budde, *Antike Mosaiken in Kilikien* I, Recklinghausen, 1969).

ܒܟܠ ܡܢ̈ܝܢ ܘܒܟܠ ܕܡ̈ܝܢ
The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy
An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai

Proefschrift
ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor
aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. L. Leertouwer,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der godgeleerdheid,
volgens besluit van het college van dekanen
te verdedigen op dinsdag 2 juni 1992
te klokke 16.15 uur

door
Judith Frishman
geboren te New York City, New York in 1953

Leiden 1992

1412/95
Acc. Nr. 523/95

Promotiecommissie

Promotor	Prof.dr. L. Van Rompay
Referent	Dr. R.P. Murray, Heythrop College (University of London)
Overige leden	Dr. G.J. Reinink, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen Prof.dr. J. Hoftijzer Dr. E.P. Meijering Prof.dr. T. Muraoka

Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek • Vorderer Orient •
Halle
Zweigbibl.
Ho I

Table of Contents

Part 1
Edition

Preface 3*
Homily I. On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah 1
Homily II. On the Flood 21
Homily III. On the Blessings Which Noah Gave His Sons 53
Homily IV. On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues 69
Homily V. On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle 87
Homily VI. On the Brazen Serpent 101

Part 2
Translation

Preface 3*
Homily I. On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah 1
Homily II. On the Flood 21
Homily III. On the Blessings Which Noah Gave His Sons 53
Homily IV. On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues 71
Homily V. On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle 91
Homily VI. On the Brazen Serpent 107

Part 3
Study

Preface 3*
Bibliography 7*
Chapter One. The Life and Works of a Modest and Determined Man 1
  1.1 Narsai's Life 1
  1.2 Narsai's Works 6
    1.2.a The Extant Collections and Editions of Narsai's Homilies 6
    1.2.b Questions of Authenticity 11
    1.2.c Other Compositions Attributed to Narsai 15
    1.2.d Mēmrē and Excerpts of Works Outside of the Manuscript Tradition of Narsai's Homilies 16

Chapter Two. The Ways and Means of God's Economy 18
- 2.1 Divine Economy and the Homilies on Creation 18
- 2.2 A Creation Without Hope and Hope for the Hopeless 23
- 2.3 Moral Instruction 24
- 2.4 Revelations 26
  - 2.4.a The Varieties of Revelations 26
  - 2.4.b The Working of Revelations 28
- 2.5 Types 31
- 2.6 Narsai's Heritage 34
  - 2.6.a Theodore of Mopsuestia 34
  - 2.6.b Ephrem 37
  - 2.6.c The Tradition of the School 39

Chapter Three. Creation, Sin and the Restoration of Hope 43
- 3.1 Corruption Reversed (Homily I) 43
- 3.2 Enoch as a Link in the Chain of the Righteous 45
- 3.3 Elijah as a Sign of Peace 48
- 3.4 The Ascension of Christ as the Gateway to Renewal 49
- 3.5 Ephrem's Understanding of How Enoch and Elijah Pleased God 52
- 3.6 Ephrem's Concept of Mortality, Immortality and Free Will 54
- 3.7 A Comparison of Narsai and Ephrem 57
- 3.8 Jacob of Sarug in Ephrem's Footsteps 59
- 3.9 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem 64
- 3.10 Enoch and Elijah in the East-Syrian Tradition 65
  - 3.10.a Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa 65
  - 3.10.b Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išo'dad of Merv 68

Chapter Four. From Enoch to Babel: History Repeated 70
- 4.1 From Enoch to Babel 70
- 4.2 The Flood of Iniquity and the Flood of Justice: Anger and Compassion at Work (Homily II) 71
- 4.3 A Blessed Curse (Homily III) 77
- 4.4 Rebellion in Union and Peace in Division (Homily IV) 81
- 4.5 The Balance of Justice and Grace: Ephrem's Commentary on Gen. 1-11 86
- 4.6 Narsai and Ephrem 99
- 4.7 Jacob of Sarug's Homily on the Flood 102
- 4.8 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem 107
- 4.9 Jacob of Sarug's Homily on the Tower of Babel 110
- 4.10 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem 113
- 4.11 Narsai and B.M. Add. 17,189 fol. 17-21 115
- 4.12 The East-Syrian Exegetes on Gen. 6-11 119
  - 4.12.a Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa 119
  - 4.12.b Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni, Išo' bar Nun and Išo'dad of Merv 122

Chapter Five. The Solid Reality is Christ 128
- 5.1 The Renewal of Creation (Homily V) 128
- 5.2 More than an Appearance (Homily VI) 131
- 5.3 The Typology of Homilies V and VI 134
- 5.4 Types and Symbols in Homilies I and III 140
- 5.5 Further Investigation of Narsai's Symbolism 142
- 5.6 Theodore's Typology 148
- 5.7 From Theodore to Narsai 155
- 5.8 The East-Syrian Exegetes on the Tabernacle and the Serpent 156
  - 5.8.a Cyrus of Edessa 156
  - 5.8.b Cosmas Indicopleustes 158
  - 5.8.c Theodore bar Koni 159
  - 5.8.d Išo'dad of Merv 161
  - 5.8.e The Anonymous Commentary (AC) 163
- 5.9 Ephrem's World - A Plethora of Symbols 164
  - 5.9.a The Tabernacle 166
  - 5.9.b The Brazen Serpent 169
  - 5.9.c Jonah 170
- 5.10 Jacob of Sarug's Omnipresent Christ 171
  - 5.10.a The Brazen Serpent 171
  - 5.10.b Jonah 173
  - 5.10.c Symbols, Types and Figures 177

Chapter Six. An Image with Many Reflections 180
- 6.1 Ephrem, Theodore and Narsai: Two Magnets of Unequal Attraction 180
- 6.2 The Beginnings of the East-Syrian Tradition 183
- 6.3 Narsai and the Later East-Syrian Tradition 185

Dutch Summary 187

Curriculum Vitae 193

ܒܟܠ ܡܢܝ̈ܢ ܘܒܟܠ ܕܡܝ̈ܢ

The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy

An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai

Part 1. Edition

Preface

The Manuscripts

The present edition contains six hitherto unpublished homilies on the Old Testament written by Narsai. Five homilies (I, III, IV, V, and VI) are dodecasyllabic in meter while one (Hom. II) is heptasyllabic. The homilies may be found in thirteen of the twenty six manuscripts listed by Macomber,[1] although no single homily is located in more than nine of these manuscripts. All of the relevant manuscripts, with the exception of Diyarbakır 71 (14th c.), are dated to the last decade of the 19th c. or the first quarter of the 20th c. Despite its late date, British Library, Oriental 5463 (1893) has been selected as the basis of this edition because it contains all six homilies (as does its sister ms. Teheran, Neesan 1). Of the remaining twelve relevant mss., eight have been consulted by me either directly or in microfilm form and serve as the basis of the critical apparatus. These mss. have already been described most extensively by Macomber,[2] upon whose work both Gignoux[3] and McLeod[4] have relied for their editions of Narsai's homilies. The presentation of the mss. which follows, which includes those mss. which I have not seen, will therefore be brief.

1. London, British Library, Oriental 5463 (=A)

This manuscript, first described by Margoliouth,[5] contains, along with Teheran, Neesan 1, the largest collection of Narsai's homilies. It was copied at Urmia in 1893 where, according to Macomber,[6] Urmia 34 is likely to have been the source of its seventy homilies attributable to Narsai. Urmia 34, written in 1715, has unfortunately been lost. At the end of the forty third homily (fol. 219v.) the following note has been added: "The homilies on the Economy which are recited during the cycle of the year written by Blessed Mar Narsai the Interpreter, end here." This is followed by the words "By the same author. Homilies recited on the Old Testament.", which precede the next homily.

The metric lines follow each other without division in strophe in this manuscript. Homilies I–VI of the present edition may be found on fol. 247v–253r, 92r–97v, 253r–257r, 257r–262r, 207v–211r and 199v–203v respectively.

---

[1] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 275-293.
[2] Macomber, *ibid.*
[3] Gignoux, p. 518-521.
[4] McLeod, p. 10-15.
[5] Margoliouth, *Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, p. 49f.
[6] *Art. cit.*, p. 287.

2. Leningrad (presently St. Petersburg), The Institue of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5 (=B)

This manuscript is undated but has been assigned to the 18th or 19th c.[7] Macomber has suggested that this collection of thirty five homilies was meant to supplement the liturgical collection of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 72 (1705), seeing that none of the homilies of the latter is included.[8] The source(s) of the homilies of this manuscript has (have) not been identified with certainty.

Like A, the lines of this manuscript are continuous. Our homilies may be located on fol. 56r–60v (I), 5v–10v (II), 19v–23r (V), 16r–19v (VI).

3. London, British Library, Oriental 9367 (=C)

Copied in Alqosh in 1896, this manuscript consists of thirty two mēmrē. Macomber has been unable to determine its relationship to other mss.[9] A comparison of the order of its homilies with that of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2 (1895) shows, however, that C follows the latter while adding one homily between the tenth and eleventh, the eleventh and twelfth, the thirteenth and fourteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth, seventeenth and eighteenth and twenty first and twenty second homilies with an additional three after the final homily. In view of the fact that Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2 was copied in Alqosh in 1895, it is likely that C was copied from it and supplemented by homilies derived from other parts of this same manuscript.

The metric lines of this manuscript are arranged by stich. Hom. I, II, V and VI may be found on fol. 53r–63v, 63v–72r, 202v–209v, 195v–202v.

4. Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55 (=D)

This manuscript, which has been described by Mingana,[10] was copied at Alqosh in 1902. Like the preceding manuscript (C), it follows the order of the homilies in Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2 and adds the same homilies to

---

[7] Pigulevskaya, *Katalog sirijskikj Leningrada*, p. 106f.

[8] *Art. cit.*, p. 283.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 289–290.

[10] Mingana, *Mingana Collection*, I, cc. 152f.

it as added by C.[11] However another five homilies are supplemented, one between the eighth and the ninth homilies of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2, another between the nineteenth and the twentieth of the latter and three at the end. The first two are not to be found in B, while the last three also occur at the end of B. This might indicate that D has copied the latter from B or from the manuscript on which it is based, because only D and B include Narsai's thirty fifth homily, the authenticity of which is disputed.[12] Moreover, despite the very differing order of homilies, B includes all the homilies of C with the addition of homilies 25, 80 and 35 of Mingana's list and two less than D. I would venture to propose that B, C and D are all derived (directly or indirectly) from Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2 (1895) and that B was copied between 1896 (the date of C) and 1902 (the date of D). The interdependence of these mss. will be further demonstrated below.

The metric lines are arranged by stich and homilies I, II, V and VI of this edition are located on fol. 48v–58v, 58v–66r, 211v–218r and 204v–211v.

5. Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 594 (=E)

This manuscript was copied in 1918 at Mosul. According to Macomber,[13] both this manuscript and Vatican Syriac 588 were jointly meant to complete the collection of homilies published by Mingana in 1905. The source of its eighteen homilies may be Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70 (the various parts) for the final fifteen and Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 (1898) for the first three (74, 75, and 53 of Mingana's list). It should be noted that these three also occur in Alqosh, Notre-Dame des Semences 161 (1898) which, for these homilies, is derived from Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69, as well as in A and its sister Teheran, Neesan 1. The latter two and part 2 of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 all are thought to derive from the now lost Urmia college 34 (see A above).

The metrical lines of this manuscript are arranged by distich. Hom. I, II and VI are found on fol 23v–29r, 61v–66v, 52r–56r.[14]

6. (Olim) Diyarbakır, Chaldean Archbishopric, 71 (=F)

This manuscript is presently located at Mardin and designated as Mardin

---

[11] In one instance there is a slight rearrangement.

[12] See ch. 1 of the Study.

[13] *Art. cit.*, p. 292–293.

[14] This manuscript was meant to include Hom. V (Hom. 57 of Mingana's list). However, the scribe accidentally copied Hom. 58 which had already been edited by Mingana, instead of Hom. 57.

60.2.[15] Although undated, its script has led scholars to assign it to the 14th c.,[16] making it the oldest manuscript of Narsai's homilies relevant to this edition. Unfortunately, only Hom. VI has survived in F, which once contained at least forty four homilies of which only twenty seven remain. McLeod's study has led him to deduce an "independent line of derivation in the 'stemma codicum'" for this manuscript.[17]

Hom. VI is on fol 25:9b–26:5a and its metrical lines run continuously, as do those of all the homilies in this manuscript.

7. London, British Library, Oriental 9363c (=G)

Copied c. 1895, none of the manuscript's fifteen homilies are included in the liturgical collections of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 72 (1705) or Leningrad, Diettrich 6 (19th c.).[18] It contains the same homilies in the exact same order as Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 3 (1895) and the two are apparently derived from the same source concerning which a hypothesis will be made below. Like F, it too contains Hom. VI only of the present edition. Each of its lines consists of one stich and the homily concerned is on fol. 177r–185r.

8. Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 588 (=H)

As noted above, this manuscript was copied together with E at Mosul in 1918 and the two are complementary. The first thirteen of its twenty one homilies occur in the same order as those in both Chaldean Patriarchate MS 72 (1705) and the first part of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 (1896),[19] although many of the homilies found in the latter two have been omitted. The next eight homilies (14–29), which include a homily already found among the first thirteen (i.e. hom. 45 of Mingana's list) have been identified by McLeod as copies of homilies in Chaldean Patriarchate MS 71 (1188/1288).[20] However, the final two homilies, nos. 20 and 21, may not be found in Chaldean Patriarchate MS 71. This means that the homilies of H are derived from three sources. The final two homilies (67 and 68 of Mingana's list and III and IV of the present edition) may

---

[15] This manuscript was consulted in microfilm form at the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London).

[16] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 282; McLeod, p. 12.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Macomber, *art. cit.*, p. 287)

[19] Homilies 1-26 of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 are arranged in precisely the same order as the twenty six homilies of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 72 and are presumably derived from it.

[20] McLeod, p. 15, esp. n.55.

be found in A, its sister I, the second part of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 (1898) and Alqosh, Notre-Dame des Semences 161 (1898). Because several of the readings in H vary from those in A and I, one must assume that it was copied either from Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69[21] or the source common to all four mss.

Each line of this manuscript consists of a distich. Homilies III and IV may be found on fol. 86r–90r and 90r–95r.

9. Teheran, Neesan 1 (=I)

This manuscript has been made available to me in the form of a microfilm located in the library of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, section des sciences religieuses (Paris). Its presence there is due to the graciousness of the Most Rev. Mar Yoḥannan S. Issayi, Chaldean Archbishop of Teheran.[22] The manuscript was copied in Sire in 1896 by David, a priest originating from the village of 'Ambe,[23] for Rev. Y. M. Neesan, an Anglican clergyman of Persian origin.[24] Its homilies, the same in number, order and title as A, are written on twenty one quires totalling 412 pages.[25] Although the numbering of the pages contains errors, the homilies themselves are uninterrupted.[26] The great similarity between A and I lead one to conclude that I was copied from A or that the two share an identical source.[27]

Each page of I is divided into two columns of forty three lines each, reading from the top of a column until its end. Each line contains one metrical stich. Hom. I–VI are on the following pages of I: 286–294, 104–109, 294–299, 299–305, 241–245, 232–236.

---

[21] Alqosh, Notre-Dame des Semences 161 is thought to have been copied from the Chaldean Patriarchate manuscript. Cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 290.

[22] I wish to thank Dr. A. Desreumaux of the École Pratique for making this microfilm accessible to me.

[23] Cf. Gignoux, p. 520.

[24] For Neesan's travels to the east, see Reed, *Mission*, p. 33-35. Neesan presented two syriac mss. to Pierpont Morgan in 1898 (see Montgomery, "Two Syriac MSS.", p. 113) and another (containing works by Isaac of Nineveh) to the Bodleian Library in the same year (cf. Brock, "Isaac of Nineveh", p. 28-33).

[25] Although no full description of this manuscript has been published, the quality of the microfilm does not allow for a precise description. I wish to note that prior to the commencement of the homilies, a page differing in size from the rest of the manuscript has been inserted. The homilies of the manuscript have been divided into two lists on this page, perhaps according to derivation.

[26] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 289.

[27] McLeod, p. 13 and 18, considers the two to be sister mss.

10. Baghdad, Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70

The first two parts of this four-part codex were copied in 1895 at Alqosh. The second two parts, according to Macomber,[28] are likely to be of the same date. Parts 1 and 2 seem to be of the same origin while parts 3 and 4 are derived from different sources. Hom. I, II and V may be found in part 2 of this codex (fol. 55r–66r, fol. 66r–74v, 155r–162r) and Hom. VI in part 3 (fol. 78v–86r). These may be the sources used by some of the manuscripts consulted for this edition. Unfortunately, I have been able to study neither this manuscript nor the following two.

11. Baghdad, Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69

This codex, like the previous one, consists of parts which differ in origin. Part 1 was copied in Alqosh in 1896 and part 2 was copied there as well in 1898. It is the second part of this codex which is of interest for the present study as it contains homilies III (fol. 339r–347v) and IV (fol. 347v–357v).

12. Alqosh, Notre-Dame des Semences 161

Copied in Alqosh in 1898, the homilies of this manuscript are all found in the various parts of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70 and may derive from it.[29] This manuscript is also possibly related to some of the manuscripts used for this edition.

The Interdependence of the Manuscripts

Hom. VI, the only homily which is attested in eight of the nine mss. available to me, is the most valuable for determining the interdependence of the mss. Three groups of mss. may be established for this homily: AI, BCD and EFG. EFG deviate most from AI and this is true not only for the absence or presence of an initial *waw* or of seyamē but for whole words or even entire stiches. BCD generally agree with AI but when stiches are omitted in AI, the stiches provided by BCD differ from those of EFG which are to be preferred. Occasionally BCDEFG together have a reading other than AI. I would venture to propose that E (for Hom. VI only) and G are both derived from F through the mediation of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 3. An argument in favor of a common origin for the four manuscripts is that homilies 47 and 51 of

---

[28] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 287.
[29] Macomber, *art. cit.*, p. 290.

Mingana's list as well as the homily attributed to Išoʻyahb of Adiabene are found in these four mss. only. The fact that E and G sometimes agree when opposing F might indicate the presence of an intermediary source, i.e. Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 3. However, prior to a consultation of the latter, no definitive answer may be provided. As for BCD, the three are clearly related and at least C and D are derived from Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2. If B is not derived from the same, its source must be very close to Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2.[30] Considering the many agreements between AI and BCD, it would seem likely that all derive from the now lost Urmia 34.

It will be recalled that aside from Hom. VI, E also includes Hom. I and II. These homilies, however, are not derived from the same source as that of Hom. VI (i.e., Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 3 which does not contain Hom. I and II). The readings provided by E for Hom. I and II agree with those of BCD and like them, are derived from Chaldean Patriarchate MS 70, part 2.

The relationship between A, I and H may be established on the basis of Hom. III and IV. As noted above, the instances where I agrees with H as opposed to A are not of major importance for the text. Where variants in whole words occur, it is I which agrees with A as opposed to H. One may thus conjecture that although all three are descendants of Urmia 34, H is probably derived from Alqosh, Notre-Dame des Semences 161 (1898) or the second part of Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69 (1898).[31]

Remarks on the Critical Edition

The text of the base manuscript British Library, Oriental 5463 (=A) has been reproduced as faithfully as possible, including obvious (grammatical) errors. Omitted words or stiches which occur in other mss. have been supplemented between square brackets except where more than one reading is available. In the latter case, the alternatives are offered in the apparatus. Lacunae which could not be supplemented have been indicated by three dots within square brackets.

---

[30] B contains many scribal errors and corrections. Many of these corrections change the reading from one in agreement with AI to one in agreement with CD. It has not always been possible for me to determine on the basis of the microfilm, whether or not these corrections were made by a second hand. If this should prove to be the case, the corrections need be viewed as a purposeful attempt to adapt B, in origin closer to AI, to CD.

[31] For the relationship between Notre-Dame des Semences 161 and Chaldean Patriarchate MS 69, cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 290 and McLeod, p. 15, esp. n.52.

Orthographic variants are also noted in the apparatus with the exception of contracted forms (e.g. ܗܢܘ and ܗܢܐ ܗܘ), composite terms (e.g. ܒܪ̈ܢܫܐ and ܒܪ̈ ܐܢܫܐ), linked words (e.g. ܒܟܠܒܪ̈ܢܫ and ܒܟܠ ܒܪ̈ܢܫ) and ܐ above intervocalic ܝ. When no siglum is used, remarks in the critical apparatus concern the base manuscript.

The metrical lines of the text, unlike A, have been grouped as distiches or, in the case of Hom. II, in strophes of four stiches, indicated by the alternating punctuation at the end of the stiches. These groupings follow those mss. which present one stich per line. However, I have not followed the punctuation at the end of the stiches found in these mss. on the occasions when the copyist confused the groupings due to omitted stiches.

The base manuscript is not entirely vocalized although some vowel dots and diacritical points have been supplied. The use of diacritical points in this edition has been expanded slightly beyond that of A. When the identification of a verb form has been made possible either by the meter or the vowel dots provided by the copyist of A, a diacritical point has been supplied in the edition. The 3rd pers. masc. sing. of the pe‘al perf. is indicated by a dot placed (most often) under the first consonant of the verb form, e.g. ܟ̣ܬܒ (*ktab*). However, a diacritical point is not found under the ܗ of ܗܘܐ when it is used as an enclitic. The masc. sing. form of the act. part. of the pe‘al has a dot above the verb form, mostly in its middle, e.g. ܪܚ̇ܡ (*rāḥem*). The forms of pa“el perf. and impf. have a dot above the first consonant of the verb forms, e.g. ܚ̇ܘܝ (*ḥawwi*). The first pers. sing. of the perf. has a dot under the ending, e.g. ܟܬܒܬ̣ (*ketbet*) whereas the second person has it above the ending, e.g. ܟܬܒܬ̇ (*ktabt*). The 3rd pers. fem. sing. is not marked, e.g. ܟܬܒܬ (*ketbat*), neither is the pass. part. of the pe‘al, e.g. ܓܠܐ (*glē*).

Diacritical points are also used to distinguish certain noun forms, e.g. ܥܒ̇ܕܐ (*‘bādā*), as opposed to ܥܒ̣ܕܐ (*‘abdā*) and ܥܘ̇ܠܐ (*‘awwālā*) as opposed to ܥܘ̣ܠܐ (*‘awlā*) and ܥܘ̇ܠܐ (*‘ulā*). For the pronouns ܗ̇ܘ, ܗ̇ܝ, ܗ̇ܢܘܢ, and ܗ̇ܢܝܢ as well as for the suffix pronouns ܗ̇/ܗ, the general rules of syriac orthography are followed.

Abbreviations

add. = added
corr. = corrected/correction
del. = deleted
dit. = dittography
fem. = feminine
foll. = followed
hom. = homoioteleuton/homoioarcton
in. = initial
inv. = inverted/inversion
marg. = margin
masc. = masculine
om. = omitted/omit(s)
prec. = preceded
sey. = seyamê

Homily I

On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah

Sigla of Manuscripts

A = London, British Library, Oriental 5463
B = Leningrad, The Institute of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5
C = London, British Library, Oriental 9367
D = Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55
E = Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 594
I = Teheran, Neesan 1

ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒܪ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܟܝܢ. ܕܐܡܝܪ ܠܗ ܥܠ
ܥܘܢܝܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܘܕܐܠܗܐ.

ܚܛܝܬܐ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܢܦܠܘ ܥܠ ܐܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܥܢ̈ܢܐ:
ܘܐܚܫܟܘ ܫܘܦܪܗ، ܕܠܐ ܬܬܚܙܐ ܒܓܠܝܐܝܬ.
ܒܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܦܩ ܪܫ ܓܢܣܢ ܡܢ ܦܪܕܝܣܐ:
ܘܐܬܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܐܚ̈ܝܕ ܢܦܫܗ ܥܠ ܡܦܩܬܗ.
ܒܐܪܥܐ ܪܒܐ ܝܬܒ ܘܕܘܝܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܝܬܐ: 5
ܕܫܒܘ ܕܟܬܝܒ ܕܢܫܪܘܢܗ، ܒܗܬܐ ܠܪܘܒܒ ܦܓܪܗ.
ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܥܠܬܗ ܡܬܒܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܘܡܚܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܐܟܪ: ܝ ܠܟ ܒܪܘܢܐ.
ܝ ܠܟ ܒܪܘܢܐ ܦܢܝܗ، ܒܪܘܢܐ ܒܪ ܡܠܟܝ ܠܗ:
ܘܕܫܒܘ ܠܒܬܐ ܕܗܦܟ ܠܐܪܒܗ ܗܦܟܘ ܐܬܬܢܝܘ. 10
ܗܦܟܐ ܕܠܐܪܒܗ ܐܚܒܪ ܐܝܟܢ ܠܫܒ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܦܫܩܘ ܡܫܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܗܒ ܦܢܐ ܠܗܬ ܫܘܬܐ.
ܒܫܘܬ ܫܢܘܗ، ܐܫܬܢܝ ܗܘܘ ܒܪ: ܐܬܬܩܢ:
ܘܐܪܝܘ ܗܢܢ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܗ ܕܡܢ ܝ ܐܕܡܘܗܝ.
ܚܘܒܠ ܦܓܪܗ ܡܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܓܢܫܐ: 15
ܕܐܡܢ ܦܪܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܝܘܗ ܕܝ ܠܒܢܐ ܡܠܠܐ.
ܒܥܠܠܬܗ ܬܗܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܒܢܝܐ ܥܒܝܕܐ:
ܕܠܒܪܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܒ̈ܝ ܓܒܝ ܦܓܪܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܡܠ̈ܠܐ.
ܗܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܠ ܢܨ̈ܚܬܗ ܡܩܕܡ ܡܦܠܬܗ:
ܘܕܐܒܠ ܘܒܟܐ ܬܘܪ ܘܐܬܕܟܪܘ ܥܠ ܡܦܠܬܗ. 20
ܚܛܝܬܐ ܗܦܫܬܗ ܠܝ ܠܒܢܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܫܒ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܡܗܒܬܗ ܠܒܪܐ ܠܡܦܠܬܐ ܡܢܐ ܘܒܫܒܘ ܦܓܪܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܒܚܒܝܬܐ ܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ ܒܚܒܝܬܐ ܕܒܠܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܥܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܒܠ ܡܬܚܬܗ.
ܡܚܬܐ ܫܡܥܘܗ، ܡܢ ܒܕܝܐ ܕܐܟܠ ܦܐܪܐ: 25
ܘܡܬܪܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܕܠܐܪܒܐ ܬܦܫܘܢ.

Title. ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ܕܐܡܝܪ ܠܗ ܥܠ ܥܘܢܝܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܘܕܐܠܗܐ. BCDE, add. ܕ in marg. C, add. ܡܐܡܪܐ: ܢ ܥܠ ܥܘܢܝܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܘܐܠܗܐ. in marg. I — 3. ܒܓܠܝܐܝܬ] before corr. prec. by ܕܠܐ ܬܬܚܙܐ (dit.) B — 6. ܕܢܫܪܘܢܗ،] final ܗ، above line — 10. ܐܬܬܢܝܘ] add in. ܘ D — 13. ܐܫܬܢܝ] first , above line

ܠܐܪܥܐ ܦܩܕܗ ܗܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܠܐܪܒܥܐ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܪܗܛ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܬܚܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܦܪܕܝܣܐ.
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܚܛܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܓܒܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ:
ܘܐܪܟ ܒܐܦ̈ܘܗ، ܥܒܪܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܚܒܠ ܠܗ.
ܒܥܒܪܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܟܪ̈ܘܒܐ:
ܘܡܬܗܦܟܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܚܪܒܐ ܚܪܒܬ ܙܟܬ ܦܐܪܐ.
ܙܟܬ ܦܐܪܐ ܕܐܦܩܬܗ ܠܐܕܡ ܡܢ ܦܪܕܝܣܐ:
ܘܫܝܢ ܕܗ̈ܘܐ ܘܐܒܪܘ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܥܡܢܝܐ.
ܒܪܬܐ ܚܠܘ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܟܠܐ ܥܠ ܡܦܩܬܗ:
ܘܫܒܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܚܒܒܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ̇ ܠܡܦܩܬܗ ܒܫܠܡ.
ܐܝܟ ܒܝܬ ܟܟܐ ܒܒܝܙ ܗܘܐ ܚܠܝܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܐܘܪܚܬܗ ܡܬܡܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘ̈ܡܝܢ.
ܡܠ̈ܐܟܐ ܘܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܡܒܪܟܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ̇ ܠܡܦܩܬܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܫܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܬܫ̈ܒܚܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܚܘܒܠܗ.
ܫܒܚܘܗ ܚܝ̈ܠܬ ܒܐܦ̈ܘܗ، ܚܝ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ:
ܘܡܬܟܐܒ ܗܘܐ * ܘܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܒܠ ܠܐܬܪܗ. * f. 248r
ܠܐܚܘܪܢܐ ܥܒܕܗ، ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘܪܢܐ ܡܬܗܦܟ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܒܦ̈ܘܡܐ ܘܙܪ̈ܙܪܐ ܡܬܬܙܝܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܟܦܝܦܐܝܬ ܡܬܬܢܝܚ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܡܗܠܟܗ.
ܒܚܝܠ ܗܘܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܘܥܫܝܢ ܪܓܠܗ ܘܡܢ ܙܐܘܒܠܗ:
ܘܡܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܥܡܠܟ ܙܟ̈ܝܐ ܕܟܢ̈ܘܫܬܗ.
ܒܫ̈ܢܝ ܢܦܫܗ ܫܥܫܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܠ̈ܐܟܐ ܘܫ̈ܢܝܐ:
ܘܡܬܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܙܢ̈ܝ ܒܩܘ̈ܦܗ ܒܡܠܐ ܘܥܬܩܐ.
ܒܡܠܐ ܘܥܬܩܐ ܡܬܡܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܙܢ̈ܝ ܒܩܘ̈ܦܗ:
ܘܕܪܐ ܠܕܪܐ ܡܫܒܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܒܪܘܝܬܗ ܫܘܦ̈ܪܗ،
ܟܕ ܗܘܦܟܢܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܥܡܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܬܐ، ܡܫܬܐ ܡܫܚܠ ܠܕܘ̈ܪܗ، ܕܠܐ ܚܘܣܢܐ.
ܒܒܢ̈ܘܗ، ܕܐܕܡ ܓܙ، ܡܫܬܐ ܕܐܟܠ ܐܕܡ:
ܘܟܠܗ ܠܗܝܟܠ ܒܡܒܪܐ ܙܢܝܚܐ ܕܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ.
ܒܡܬܗ ܕܟܐܢܐ ܐܡܠܟ ܡܫܬܐ ܥܠ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܗܘܘ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܒܒܪܐ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܐܒܠܘܬܐ.

---

35. ܥܠ] corr. from ܕܥܠ A, ܕܥܠ I — 38. ܗܘܐ] above line C — 44. ܗܘܐ] above line B — 48. ܗܘܐ] above line

ܥܠܡܐ ܒܥܒܕܐ ܐܟܪܙ، ܕܢܫܐ ܕܟܠ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܘܐܬܡܥܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܒܡܝܬܘܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܥܡܠܬܗ ܫܠܡܬܐ ܠܦܓܪܗ ܕܐܕܡ:
ܘܝܗܒܬܗ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܢܬܬܪܣܐ ܒܗ ܐܣܟܡܬܐ.
ܐܣܟܡܬ ܐܒܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܐܒܠܐ ܠܐܘܒܠܐ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܚܘܣ ܡܟܣܟܣ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܚܪܒܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ.
ܒܚܠܡܗ ـ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܓܒܪ ܚܘܒܠܗ ܕܡܫܚܠܦܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܨ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܛܬ ܒܗ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ.
ܥܠ ܚܘܒܠܗ ܐܒܝܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܡܡܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܡܬܬܢܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܡܬܐܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܫܥܫܥܐܝܬ.
ܫܒ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ̇ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܒܪܝܬܐ:
ܘܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܐܟܘܬ، ܬܘܠܕ ܗܟܢ ܫܘܬܐ.
ܠܗܠܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܢܚܐ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܢܚܐ ܠܗ ܟܠ:
ܘܐܫܟܚ ܡܢܝܚ، ܗܒܪܐ ܛܒܐ ܠܕܠܐ ܗܒܪܐ.
ܗܒܪܐ ܛܒܐ ܙܢ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܒܐܕ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܟܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܫܬܒܩ ܠܥܒܕܘܬ ܡܘܬܐ.
ܚܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܢܛܪ ܒܗܘܢܗ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܒܠܐ:
ܘܒܝܐܗ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܠܥܡܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܓܢܝܗ ܠܚܢܘܟ ܪܫܡ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܢܛܪܗ ܒܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܢܛܪ ܒܗ ܗܒܪܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ.
ܗܒܪܐ ܐܚܪܢ ܚܕ ܥܒܕܗ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܫܦܪܐ:
ܕܫܦܪ ܗܟ ܒܒܕܗ ܠܫܦܪܗ ܗܒܪܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ.
ܫܦܪ ܠܡ ܟܐܢܐ ܟܬܒ ܥܠ ܟܐܢܐ ܒܣܦܪܗ ܕܡܘܫܐ:
ܘܡܠܠ ܕܫܦܪ ܢܛܪܗ ܠܫܦܪܗ ܒܓܒܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܠܡܠܐ ܓܪܗ ܠܝ ܠܡܠܐ ܕܫܦܪܬܗ:
ܘܡܥܝܢܗ ܒܫܢ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܛܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܒܠ.
ܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܚܘܐܗ، ܠܫܦܪܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܢ ܠܡ ܐܕܡ:
ܘܢܕܬܗ ܒܚܢܘܟ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܬܘܡܢܐ ܕܢܦܠ ܡܘܬܐ.
ܚܘܒ ܡܘܬܐ ܓܙܪܐ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܒܚܝ̈ܘܗ، ܕܚܢܘܟ:
ܘܒܢܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܚܪܘ ـ ܥܠ ܚܘܒܠܐ.
ܥܠ ܚܘܒܠܗ ـ ܐܒܝܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܠܕ̈ܘܗ، ܕܐܕܡ:
ܡܛܠ ܕܐܕܡ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܫܦܪ ܚܢܘܟ ܠܐܠܗܐ.

---

70. ܕܐܟܘܬ،] above line — 79–80. omit stiches I — 84. ܒܫܢ̈ܐ] ܒ above line

ܒܟ̈ܕܪܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܡܬܟܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܡܝܘܬܐ:
* ܘܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܣܒܪܐ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܠܡܝܘܬܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ. * f. 248v
ܠܫܬܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܢ ܡܬܝܚ ܢܟ̈ܕܪܝܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܟ̈ܕܪܢܐ:
ܘܡܫܡܥܢܐ ܫܡܥܘ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܣܒܪ ܚܝ̈ܐ.
ܒܕܪܐ ܕܫܡܥܐ ܫܡܥܘ ܡܢܘ̈ܬܐ ܣܒܪܬܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܛܠܒ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܠܐ ܗܦܟܘ ܐܕܪܟܘ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ.
ܡܫܡܥ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܠܗ̇ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܚܝܢ:
ܘܡܬܕܡܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܡܢܐ ܗ̄ܝ ܘܒܠܚܘܕ ܢܛܪܗ ܒܚܝ̈ܐ.
ܟܠܗܘܢ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܠܫܡܥܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܕܫܡܥܢ ܒܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܡܫܡܥܐ ܠܫܡܥܐ ܕܚܝܬ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ.
ܠܘ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܡܣܩܗ ܠܥܠܬܐ ܕܡܗܠܟ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܫܡܥܘܗ ܘܚܙܘܗ ܣܠܩ.
ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܠܗܕܐ ܙܘܥܬܐ:
ܘܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܪܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܒܥܘܬܗ̇.
ܒܗܢܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܥܠܝܗ ܒܪܝܬܗܘܢ ܪ̈ܘܚܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܫܪܝܘ ܚܕܝܢ ܒܛܠܒܐ ܛܠܒܐ ܕܚܘܕܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܟܐܠܗܐ ܪܒܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܫܡܥܘ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܛܠܒܐ ܕܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܚܕܘ ܘܐܬܒܣܡܘ.
ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܕܚܝܘܢ ܒܢܫܐ ܘܐܝܢ ܠܥܡ̈ܡܐ:
ܘܫܦܠܗ ܐܝܢ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܒܦܠܓܐ ܕܡܣܒܪ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ.
ܚܙܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܢܦܫܗ ܠܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܕܡܝܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܝܡܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܡܫܠܡܘ ܘܡܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܕܐܐܪ.
ܒܟܠܐ ܗܪܡܐ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܠܒܟܠܐ ܕܚܠܦ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܡܬܒܣܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܡܣܒܪܘܬܗ.
ܙܟܪܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܝܟܢ ܠܡܒܒܠ ܗܘܦܟ:
ܘܦܟܠܗ ܘܡܠܟܗ ܠܗ̇ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܐܝܟܢ.
ܠܦܘܩܕܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܥܠܡܐ ܙܘܥܐ ܡܫܬ̈ܟܚܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܬܪܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܥܘܢܝܗ ܕܚܢܢ ܘܠܚܡܐ.
ܫܢܝܢ ܐܪܟܗ ܠܓܠܕ ܕܢܟܐ ܕܡܬܬܡܬܐ:
ܘܫܡܥ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܡܫܒ̈ܚܢܐ ܒܥܘܪ ܫܡܥܘܗ̇.
ܫܡܥܘܗ̇ ܦܣܩܘܗ̇ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ:
ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܡܬܦܫܩܐ ܒܗ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ.

---

93. ܡܬܝܚ] read ܡܬܝܚܘ as BCDE

ܗܡܢܪܐ ܕܚܝܢܐ ܢܦܩܗ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܡܢܗ ܕܒܠܚܐ:
ܘܢܛܪܗ ܒܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܢܛܪ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܓܢܣܗ.
ܡܕܪܐ ܐܘܫܛܗ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܡܕܘܪܐ ܟܠ ܡܪ ܟܠ:
ܘܚܙܐ ܐܝܟܢ ܒܟ̈ܕܪܐ ܡܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ.
ܒܡܘܬܐ ܢܟܕܪܗ ܠܗ̇ ܘܡܫܡܥܬܐ ܡܫܡܥܬ ܡܕܪܐ:
ܘܚܙܗ̇ ܒܢ̈ܝܫܐ ܒܝܘܡܗ ܫܢܝܐ ܕܚܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܚܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܠܟܐ ܒܚܝ ܦܘܪܩܐ ܕܒܗܪܐ ܕܕܝܢ:
ܘܠܒܒܗ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܐܝܟܢ ܡܫܡܥܢܐ ܣܠܩ ܫܡ̈ܝܐ.
ܫܡ̈ܝܐ ܗܘܘ ܟܠܗ ܒܢܫܐ ܐܪܙܢܝܐ:
ܘܡܫܬܘܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܐ ܦܪܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܫܡܥܬ ܫܡ̈ܝܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܗ̄ܝ ܥܡܠܗ ܠܚܝܢ ܐܝܟܢ ܡܫܡܥܢܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܗܕܝܢ ܠܡܦܪܚ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܡܬܠܡ ܟܠܗ.
ܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܫܘܒܚܐ ܫܡܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܥܡܘܪܐ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܦܪܚܘܗ̇ ܦܪܚܘܗ̇ ܒܚܝܘܢ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܝܢ.
ܐܝܟܢ ܒܪܟܐ ܗ̄ܘܐ ܥܦܪܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܓܢܣܗ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܦܪܚܝܢ ܫܦܝܪ ܫܘܒܚܬܐ ܕܡܣܒܪ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ.
ܟܕ ܟܠ̈ܠܬܐ ܐܠܦ ܐܝܟܢ ܠܡܦܪܚ ܫܘܒܚܐ:
ܘܐܦܝܢ ܗ̄ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ ܥܠ ܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ.
ܠܘ ܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܘܟܕ ܚܛܝܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܗܘ ܡܬܒܥ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܢܫܢܐ ܚܛܝܐ ܚܕ.
* ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܣܘܟܡܗ ܚܛܝܐ ܕܒܟܪ ܒܪܝܢܗ ܕܚܝܢ: * f. 249r
ܘܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܥܘܢܝܗ ܡܕܡ ܕܢܚܝܘܗܝ.
ܡܬܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܗܒܪ ܒܥܘܪ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܓܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܒܪܝܢܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ.
ܟܠܗܘܢ ܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ ܚܙܝ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܡܬܠܡ ܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ:
ܘܡܬܓܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܡܠ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܒܕܠܐ ܢܛܘܢ.
ܡܦܣ ܗܘܐ ܓܘܠܒܝܢ ܒܐܕܡ ܘܒܢܘܗܝ ܒܕܠܐ ܢܦܠܘܢ:
ܘܡܬܓܒܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܙܪܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܘܢܒܪ ܓܘܠܒܝܢ.
ܟܕ ܟܠ̈ܠܬܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܢܗ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܒܢ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܝܗܒ ܠܝ ܣܒܪܐ ܒܝܕ ܥܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܝܢ.
ܥܕ ܠܚܝܢ ܘܢܛܪܗ ܒܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܝ̈ܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܫܡܥܢܗ ܐܡܪ ܣܒܪܐ ܠܡܫܪܐ ܕܕܝܢ.

---

125. ܡܪ ܟܠ] written as ܡܪܟܠ A, read ܡܪܐ ܟܠ as E — 135. ܫܦܝܪܐ] ܐܫܦܝܪܐ D — 136. ܦܪܚܘܗ̇, ܒܚܝܘܢ] inv. C — 148. ܗܘܘ] in marg. in 2nd hand(?) B

ܫܦܝܪܐ ܠܟܠܐ ܡܢܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܒܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܚܢܘܟ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܗܕܝܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܥܡܗ ܠܕܪ̈ܬܗܝܢ.
ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܪܕܘ ܬ̈ܠܕܬܗ ܒܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܫܡܝܐ:
ܘܫܪܘ ܬܠܝܢ ܐܪ̈ܙܝ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ـ ܕܪܐ ܠܕܪܐ.
ܠܡܢ ܚܠܝܬܐ ܡܥܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܐܪܙܐ:
ܒܪ ܬܢܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܝ ܠܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܢܘܚ ܐܝܟ ܪܒܐ ܡܫܒܚ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܟܠ ܒܥܘܬܪܬܗ:
ܘܡܚܣܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܪܒ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܚܘܕܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܟܕ ܒܥܘܬܪܬܗ ܓܠܝܐ ܙܕܩܐ ـ ܒܝ ܡܪܗ:
ܕܡܠܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܘܩ ܐܢܫܐ ܟܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ـ ܡܢ. ܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܥܠܡܝܢ ܥܠ ܩܠܝܠ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܫܦܝܪܐ:
ܕܟܠܟܢܐ ـ ܫܢܝ̈ܢ ܚܕ ܫܒܥܐ ܕܚܫܒܢ ܕܝܢ.
ܒܚܫܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܪܕܘ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܒܕܡܟܐ ܠܐܒܪܗܡ.
ܘܢܘܚ ܕܗܦܠܝܢܗܘ ـ ܟܠܟܢܐ ـ ܥܢܝܐ ܕܚܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܘܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܫܒܥܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܡܛܠ ܫܒܥܐ ܚܒܪܗ ܠܟܐܢܐ ܠܚܝܘ̈ܬܗ.
ܠܟܐܢܐ ܕܫܒܥܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܓܢܣܗ:
ܘܒܗ ܒܝܕ ܐܠܦܐ ܕܢܘܚ ܓܠܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ.
ܡܢ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܥܕܡܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܪܘܚܬ ܩܘܫܬܐ:
ܐܦ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܓܠܐ ـ ܒܚܝܘܗܝ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܚܕ ـ ܒܝܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܘܒܕܡܗ ܒܟܐ̈ܢܐ ܟܕ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܐܫܬܡܠܝ.
ܠܐܒܪܗܡ ܐܡܪ ܕܟܕ ܙܪܥܗ ܡܒܪܟ ܒܟ̈ܐܢܐ:
ܘܠܒܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܡܢ ܡܥܠܗ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ.
ܚܕ ܒܬܪ ܚܕ ܢܚܠܘ ܐܝܟ ـ ܠܥܘܡܪ ܡܠܟܘܬܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܘܗܝ ܒܗ ܐܝ ـ ܒܝܢܗ.
ܠܟܦ̈ܢܐ ܫܘܝܗ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ:
ܕܢܘܚ ـ ܙܕܝܩ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܠܟܠܐ ܒܟܐܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ـ ܕܪ̈ܐ ܙܒܢܗ ܠܢܘܚܐ ܕܦܘܪܩ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܒܟܐ ܡܫܡܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܫܠܦ ܢܘܦܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܓܠܝ̈ܢܐ.
ܟܕ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܢܚܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܡܫܡ̈ܥܢܐ:
ܕܢܘܚ ـ ܡܕܚܝܡ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܥܡ ܐܬܘܬܐ.

---

160. ܗܘܐ] above line B — 179. ܢܚܠܘ] ܢܚܠ C — 184. ܒܟܐ] read ܟܕ as B(corr. from ܒܟܐ) CDE — 186. ܐܬܘܬܐ] corr. from ܒܐܘܬܐ D

ܐܘܪܚܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܕܢܪܥ ܒܢܒ̈ܝܐ ܠܡܕܪܐ ـ ܐܕܡܗ:
ܘܒܬܪ ܫܘܫܗ ܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܘܟܗܢܐ.
ܢܒܝܐ ܘܟܗܢܐ ܓܒܐ ܠܗ ܒܪܒܝܐ ܕܦܠܚܘܬ ܟܗ̈ܢܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܚܣܝܐ ܐܝ̈ ـ ܒܝܢܗ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ.
ܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܟܗܢܘܬܗ ܐܫܠܡ ܒܐܝܕ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܕܢܕܪܐ ܘܢܡܣܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܥܡܗ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܩܘܫܬܐ.
ܐܦܛܪܘܦܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܒܐܪܥܐ:
* f. 249v ܕܢܗܘܐ ܪܒ ـ ܥܒ̈ܕܝ * ܡܪܗ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܪܗ.
ܦܪܘܫܐ ܟܐܢܐ ܦܪܫ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܥܒ̈ܕܝ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܫܒܝܚܐܝܬ ܝܗܒ ܡܘܗܒܐ ܒܚܘܒܐ ܘܫܒܚܐ.
ܒܝܗܒܬܐ ܕܚܘܒܐ ܪ̈ܒܐ ܠܡܘ̈ܕܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܐ̈ܠܦ ܐܢܘ ـ ܕܠܐ ܢܫܬܠܡ ـ ܥܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܡܕܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܡܢܘ ܡܘ̈ܕܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܒܪܗܡ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܚܙܝܪܐ ܢܦܩ ܐܢܘ ـ ܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ.
ܚܙܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܗ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܠܓܒܝܐ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܐܢܘ ـ ܠܒܪܝܬܐ ܟܕ ܠܐ ـ ܟܢ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ـ ܟܢ ܓܒܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܚܝܡ ܐܫܠܡ ܘܥܕܐ ܠܦܘܠܚܢ ܕܢ̈ܘܐ.
ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܥܡ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܪܚܡ ܒܪܘܟܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܠܒܘܫܬܐ ܕܦܬܟܪܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܚܟܝܡ.
ܢܒܝܐ ܕܢ̈ܝܫܪܐ ܟܕ ܚܝ ܗܘܐ ܦܘܡܗ ܕܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ:
ܘܡܫܡܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ـ ܐܝ̈ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܫܡܫܐ ܐܚܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܦܘܡܗ ـ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܙܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܠܚܟܐ ܚܛܝܐ ܪܫܡ ܦܘܡܐ.
ܒܟܠ ܐܣܟܝܡܝܢ ܢܦܩ ܐܢܘ ـ ܒܟܐܢܐ ܠܟ̈ܠܝܠܐ:
ܘܒܟܠ ܦܘܪ̈ܣܝܢ ܬܒܪܘܗܝ ܗܘܢ ـ ܠܚܙܝܐ ܕܚ̈ܠܝܗܝ.
ܚܙܐ ܗܘ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܒܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܡܒܒܥ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܩܘܫܬܐ.
ܚܣܝܢ ܒܐܬܪ̈ܐ ܗ̣ܘܐ ܐܠܝܐ ܒܢܒܝܘܬܗ:
ܘܕܠܝܚ ܗܘܢ ܒܝܕ ܟܠܟܐܢܐ ܕܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܝܠܐ.
ܟܠܟܐ ـ ܥܡܟܐ ܕܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܝܠܐ ܒܝܕ ܟܫܝܪܐ:
ܘܙܪܥ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܦ̈ܠܚܝ ܥܦܪ ܕܢܪܕܘ ـ ܒܗ.

---

201. ܚܙܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ] before corr. foll. by ܡܢܘ ܡܘ̈ܕܐ (dit.) C — 207. ܗܘܐ] above line B

ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܫܦܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܩ̈ܠܬܐ ܪܕܐ ܙܕܝܩܐ:
ܕܕܪܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܚܢܘܟ ܟܐܢܐ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ.
ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܒܢܐ ܒܪܘܟܐ:
ܘܢܛܪܗ ܒܚܫ̈ܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܒܠ ܫܘܦܪ̈ܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ.
ܗܘ ܗܘ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܫܦܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܨܒܪ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܥܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܕܘܗܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܬܚܒܠܬ ܡܢ ܕܫܦܝܪܐ.
ܠܚܕ ܦܘܪܥܢܐ ܐܚܘܝ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܕܟ̈ܝ ܢܦܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܝܗܒ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܡܚܒܠܐ ܥܠ ܦܓܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ ܐܪܝܡ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܛܠܝ̈ܐ:
ܕܢܚܘܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܐ ܒܪܚܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܗܘܘ ܛܠܝ̈ܐ.
ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܐܠܦ ܒܬܪܗ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܚܛܐ ܡܢ ܐܕܘܗܝ;
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܠܓܘܢ ܥܠ ܪܗܒܘܬܐ ܕܣܢܬ ܡܚܒ̈ܬܐ.
ܫܒܚܬ ܚܢ̈ܐ ܫܡܝܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܠܦ ܠܐܚܪܢܐ:
ܘܦܩܕ ܗܘܢܗ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܦܨ̈ܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ.
ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܗܘܘ ܗܕ̈ܝܐ ܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ:
ܕܢܪܕܘ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ.
ܠܚܢܘܟ ܥܛܦܗ ܟܠܘܪܐ ܡܕܡܐ ܕܚܣܪܐ ܕܐܕܡ;
ܘܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ ܒܬܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬ ܐܒ̈ܐ.
ܕܡܢ ܒܬ ܐܒ̈ܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܠܡܗ ܕܡܕܪܐ ܠܟܠܐ:
ܕܗܘܐ ܡܚܒܫ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܘܐܣܛܝܬܐ.
ܠܬܠܬ ܙܒ̈ܢܝܢ ܦܠܓܗ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܡܪܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܚܕ ܙܒܢܐ ܝܗܒ ܚܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܢܛܪܗ ܒܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܒܗ̇ܘ ܡܕܡܐ ܥܒܕ ܠܚܢܘܟ ܓܒܪܐ ܟܐܢܐ:
ܘܒܬܪܝܢܐ ܓܒܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܚܐ ܒܚܝܪܐ.
ܒܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܙܟܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ;
ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܦܘܡܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܟܡܐ ܥܡܝܩ ܫܘܢܝܗ.
ܐܝܟ * ܕܒܕܪ ܠܟܐ ܙ̇ܕܐ ܡܢ ܫܢܘܗ ܒܥܘܠܡ ܝܘܡ̈ܬܐ: * f. 250r
ܘܕܪ ܠܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܚ̈ܠܬܐ ܠܥܬܝܕܬܐ.
ܡܢ ܪܫ ܗܘܐ ܘܒܢܝܐ ܕܫܢܘܗ ܠܚܢܘܟ ܡܢ ܕܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܡܬܚܫܒ, ܗܘܐ ܕܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܥܫܝܢܐ.
ܚܢܘܟ ܕܐܫܬܠܝ ܐܦܢ ܒܠܫܢܗ ܥܠ ܫܘܢܝܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܟܕܡ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܬܝ ܥܒܕܗ ܘܐܡܬܐ ܗܘܝܗ.

---

226. ܝܗܒ] ܗܘܐ B(above line) CDE — 235. ܡܕܡܐ] before corr. foll. by ܡ (dit.) B | ܕܚܣܪܐ] om. ܕ D — 247. ܡܢ ܪܫ ܗܘܐ] written ܡܢ ܪܫܘܐ — 250. ܕܐܡܬܝ ܥܒܕܗ ܘܐܡܬܐ] corr. from ܕܐܡܬܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܘܐܡܬܝ

ܐܪܙܢܝܬ ܙܒܢ ܠܝ ܡܫܡܫܐ ܥܠ ܫܘܢܝܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܫܩ ܠܝ ܕܡܢܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܐܫܬܢܝ ܒܗ̇.
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܐܝܟ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܢܘܟ:
ܒܝ, ܕܫܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܪܐ ܕܫܘܪܝ ܘܟܠܐ.
ܫܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܗܒܠ ܘܒܗ ܕܚܢܘܟ ܡܢ ܕܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܩܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܙܠܝ ܫܘܢܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܘܢܝܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܫܡܥܘ ܡܕܡ̈ܐ ܒܥܒܕܗ ܕܚܢܘܟ:
ܕܐܠܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܫܡܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܢܒܝܘܬܐ.
ܩ̈ܠܐ ܫܡܝ̈ܢܐ ܡܫܬܡܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܐܠܝܐ:
ܕܦܬܟ ܘܟܠܐ ܕܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܢܒܝܐ ܠܚܒܪܗ ܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܫܡܥܢܐ ܕܦܚܠ:
ܘܡܬܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܓܠܝܢܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܠܐܚܪܢ.
ܡܢ ܚܕ ܠܐܚܪܢ ܡܬܝܒܠ ܗܘܐ ܪܡܙ ܫܘܢܝܗ:
ܟܕ ܓܕܠܝܢ ܠܗ ܟܠܝܠ ܡܘܠܩܐ ܕܓܠܝܢܘܗܝ.
ܟܠ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܡܬܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܠܝܛ ܪܘܚܐ:
ܘܡܟܪܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܢܒ̈ܝܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܠܐܬܠܝܛܘܬܗ.
ܐܬܠܝܛܘܬ ܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܕܘܟ ܠܐܚܪܢ:
ܘܟܕ ܩܪܒ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܪܡܙ ܫܘܢܝܗ.
ܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܕܢܓܠܐ ܠܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ:
ܕܠܐ ܐܢ ܘܕܘܝܗ, ܦܬܟܐ ܡܢ ܢܬܟܐ ܕܫܘܒܚܐ ܫܪܝܐ.
ܫܡܥܐܝܬ ܡܦܪܫܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܗ, ܕܐܣܬܟܠܬ:
ܒܥܒܕܐ ܕܒܪܗ ܪܘܚ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܕܟܬܘ̈ܪܐ.
ܪܘܚ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܟܕ ܡܢܗ, ܗܘܐ ܐܦܠܗ ܕܢܓܠܐ ܕܟܬܒ̈ܝ:
ܘܒܪ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܐ ܓܠܐ ܥܠ ܘܟܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܒܗ.
ܒܠܬܢܝܬ ܐܚܕ ܬܠܠ̈ܐ ܡܕܡ ܬܠܡܝܕܗ:
ܕܡܪܝܐ ܥܕܪܗ ܒܐܝܕ ܒܕܘܬܐ ܐܪܙܢܝܬ.
ܐܪܙܢܝܬ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܐܪܙ ܫܘܢܝܗ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܦܩܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ.
ܐܠܗ ܒܠܐ ܡܢܚܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܚܒܪܐ ܓܒܪܐ:
ܕܢܚܒܪ ܓܒܪܐ ܠܥܘܠ ܫܢܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ.
ܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܒܠ ܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ:
ܘܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܢܦܪ ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ.

---

266. ܘܡܟܪܙܝܢ] corr. from ܘܡܟܪܙܝܢܘ B — 271. ܡܦܪܫܢ] above line — 274. ܘܒܪ ܠܐ] ܘܠܐ BCDE | ܘܟܠܐ] foll. by ܗ̇ܘ B(above line) CDE

ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܡܬܘܚܬܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܡܬ̈ܠܐ ܒܠܥܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܪܕܐ:
ܘܡܬܘܚܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܦܘܬ ܗܘ ܡܬܘܚܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܚܝܠܐ.
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܚܙܝܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܒܫܡܝܐ:
ܘܗܘܐ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܩܕܡ ܪܚܡܘܗܝ.
ܒܚܠܡܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܚܙܐ ܒܚܙܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܬܐ:
ܘܥܒܪ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܘܚܙܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ.
ܚܙܐ ܕܒܒܐ ܪܒ ܗܘ ܕܡܒܪܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܗ:
ܘܬܒܥܗ ܘܕܒܪ ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܡܪܗ ܕܒܒܐ ܪܚܡܗ.
ܪܚܡܬ ܡܪܗ ܚܙܐ ܥܒܪܐ ܕܒܒܐ ܪܒܐ:
ܘܒܒܐ ܡܚܝܕ ܠܒ̈ܢܝ ܒܝܬܗ ܒܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ.
ܥܒܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܘܒܠܐ ܕܐܫܬܒܚ ܒܗ ܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ:
ܘܗܕܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܒ̈ܢܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܕܐܘܪܚܗ.
ܚܬܐ ܕܬܗܪܐ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ. ܥܢܐ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܕܡܪܟܒܬܐ ܢܘܪܢܝܬܐ ܕܪܘ̈ܠܐ ܒܐܐܪ.
ܪ̈ܟܒܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܚܙܐ ܕܕܒܝܩ ܒܥܓ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ:
ܘܠܟܠ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡܢܗ * ܣܘܣܘܬܐ ܢܘܪܢܝܬܐ. * f. 250v
ܢܘܪܐ ܒܢܘܪܐ ܚܙܐ ܕܐܫܬܪܝ ܒܬܪ̈ܝ ܢܘܪܐ:
ܘܡܬܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܘܚܬ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܗ.
ܒܪܘܚܬ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܫܘܒܚܗ ܡܬܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܚܙܐ ܫܦܝܪ ܠܕܫܦܝܪ.
ܚܙܐ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܕܡܢ ܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܡܚܙܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ:
ܘܦܫ ܡܢ ܬܗܪܐ ܘܦܢܐ ܠܡܥܠܠܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܬܠܡܝܕܘܗ.
ܟܠܐ ܠܗ ܒܟܠܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ:
ܘܦܩܕܗ ܠܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܕܦܐܫܐ ܠܐܪܟܐ ܠܡܬܠ.
ܫܐܠ ܡܢܗ ܐܡܪ ܪܒܐ ܡܗܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܬܠܡܝܕܗ:
ܘܫܒ ܠܟ ܡܕܡ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܒܝܬܟ ܘܡܚܝܕ ܠܟ.
ܫܐܠ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ ܕܪ ܟܐ ܒܫܦܝܐ ܕܢܒܝܘܬܐ:
ܘܢܣܒܗ ܪܒܗ ܕܐܡܢ ܢܫܐܠ ܘܐܡܢ ܢܫܟ.
ܫܐܠ ܫܐܘܠܐ ܘܝܗܒ ܡܘܗܒܐ ܬܬܠܝ ܒܣܕܐ:
ܘܫܪܝ ܢܒܝܐ ܕܢܪܕܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܠܗ.
ܒܬܪ ܒܦܪܐ ܒܠ ܡܪܟܒܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ:
ܘܐܢܫ ܒܐܢܫܘܗܝ ܒܪ̈ܟܒܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܬܕܪܟ.

---

287. ܒܚܠܡܐ] ܠܚܠܡܐ BCDE

ܪܘܚܢܐܝܬ ܒܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܪܘܚܐ ܬܚܝܬ ܒܦܪܐ:
ܘܡܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܠܪܘܚܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܠܦܓܪܐ.
ܒܪܘܚ ܦܪܚ ܗܘܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܠܒܪ ܕܐܙܠ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܡܫܬܒܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܠܐܦ̈ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܬܛܠܠܐ ܗܘܐ.
ܠܐܦ̈ ܪܘܚܐ ܢܓܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܪܕܝܐ ܠܡܐܙܠ:
ܠܘ ܠܫܡܝܐ ܐܠܐ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܠܘ ܠܫܡܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܠܐ ܒܝܘܡ ܫܘܒܚܗ:
ܐܠܐ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܫܬܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܝ ܒܪ ܚܛܗܘ.
ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܦܪܕܝܣܐ ܕܓܝܣܗ ܠܚܘܐ ܥܠܝܗ ܐܦܩܗ:
ܘܒܗ ܐܬܪܐ ܬܚܝܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܚܝܐ.
ܚܕܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܫܬܠܡܬ ܒܗ̇ ܡܢ ܝܕ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܒܗ̇ ܐܬܪܐ ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܦܐܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ.
ܒܫܘܒܚܐ ܟܠܝܠܐ ܟܕ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܟܕ ܡܫܬܠܡ:
ܠܦܘܬ ܕܡܒܪܐ ܕܟܝܢܗ ܫܪܝܪܘܬܐ ܠܡܫܬܪܝܘܬܐ.
ܥܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܐܫܬܝ ܒܗ ܚܘܝܢ ܫܦܝܪܐ:
ܘܟܢ ܩܝܡ ܗܘܘ ܙܕ̈ܝ ܫܘܒܚܗ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܠܥܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܘܒܗ ܕܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܫܚܢ:
ܘܡܫܒܚܝܢ ܗܘ̈ܘ ܐܦ ܕܡܠ̈ܬܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܫܘܒܚܗ.
ܟܕ ܕܡܠ̈ܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܦܪܫ ܐܝܟ:
ܕܢܚܘܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܟܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܗ̇ܘܐ ܠܚܪܬܐ.
ܩܕܡ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܡܪ ܒܚܝܬܐ ܕܫܘܝ ܒܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܡܬܢܐܝܬ ܒܝܘܡ ܫܘܒܚܗ ܕܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ.
ܠܪܘܡܐ ܕܠܟܠ ܒܠܥܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܫܡܫܘܢܗ، ܠܚ̈ܫܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܦܩܕ ܡܪܗ ܠܗ، ܡܫܡܫܬܐ ܒܫܘܝ ܒܒܪܗ.
ܠܪܘܡܐ ܬܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܚܕܐ ܕܪܘ̈ܠܐ ܕܗ̇، ܡܪܟܒܬܐ:
ܠܐܝܟܐ ܕܒܠܥܕ ܟܠܗ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܠܡܬܟܠܠܘ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ، ܐܡܪܢ ܕܦܠܛ ܒܪ ܬܘܬܒ̈ܐ:
ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܦܠܛ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܛܪ ܐܪܙ ܡܫܡܫܬܐ.
ܐܪܙ ܡܫܡܫܬܐ ܡܪ ܒܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܫܬܝ، ܒܗ:
ܕܗܢ ܦܠܛ ܡܢ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܒܐܪܙ ܡܫܡܫܬܗ.
ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܪܫܘ ܠܝ ܒܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܘܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܚܝܐ ܒܠܡܐܟܐ ܕܫܘܠܡ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܝ̈ܘܬܐ.

---

321. ܒܝܘܡ] ܒܗ E — 329. ܕܐܫܬܝ] before corr. foll. by ܗܘܐ A, foll. by ܗܘܐ I — 330. ܐܠܗܐ] ܕܐܠܗܐ B(in marg. in 2nd hand) CDE — 340. ܠܡܬܟܠܠܘ] ܬ above line

ܒܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܒܠ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܐܙܕܗܪܘ ܠܗ:
ܘܢܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܚܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܒܡܕܡ ܕܒܝ ܪ.
ܒܡܕܡ ܕܒܝ ܪ ܚܐܝܢ ܒܐܬ̈ܪܐ ܚܕ ܕܐܒܗܬܗܘܢ:
* f. 251r * ܒܚܝܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܦܬ̈ܝܡ ܠܗ ܐܦ ܒܡܩܕܫܬܐ.
ܒܚܝܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܗ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܐܪ̈ܥܢܝܐ:
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܫܚܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܡܩܕܫܬܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܥܢܝܐ.
ܒܗ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܢܚܝܠܐ ܡܚܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ:
ܘܢܘܗ ܬܗܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܡܚܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܢܚ̈ܫܐ.
ܬܗܪܐ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܕܐܚܝ ܚܐܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܥܫܩܝܢ ܡܢ ܫܘ̈ܬܣܬܐ ܕ ܟ̈ܠܠܐ ܥܫ̈ܝܩܐ.
ܒܗܘ ܐܬܡܬܘܗܝ ܕܙ̈ܪܝ ܚܫ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܡܓܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܥܒܪ ܐܒܘܢ.
ܗ̇ܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܡܥܠܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܙ̈ܪܝ ܫܘ̈ܬܣܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܪܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܝ̈ܫܬܐ.
ܥܒܝܕ ܒܚܝ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܦܐܐ ܪܗܛܐ ܕܕܘܒܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܠܐ ܫܦܝܪ ܕܢܬܠܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܐܡܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܠ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܗܪܟܝܢ ܗܪܟܢ ܥܡܪ:
ܘܡܛܠ ܦܘܠܚ ܕܐܕܡ ܒܟܝ ܘܢܚܬ ܚܝ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܒܗ̇ܘ ܚܝܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ ܚܝܝܢ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܠܐ ܒܥ̈ܘܢܐ ܡܗܠܠܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܪ̈ܘܚܢܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܪ̈ܘܚܢܐ ܒܬܕܡܝܢ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܪ̈ܥܢܝܐ:
ܘܦܪܡ ܥܒܕ ܬܪܝܢ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܠܥܘܙܪ ܟܠܐ.
ܠܥܘܙܪ ܟܠܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܬܪܝܢ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܕܒܡܫܝܚܘܗܘܢ ܢܛܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܬܕ̈ܪܬܐ.
ܗܡܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܦܥܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܕܒܪ̈ܝ ܢܦܫܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܥܘܠܐ ܕܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܘܝܐ.
ܒܢܝܐ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܒܝܢ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܘܪܒܐ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܛܥܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܦܗܡ ܒ̈ܝ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ.
ܦܗܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܐܚܝܝܗܘܢ ܒܝܐ ܚܝܐ ܟܠ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܫܒ̈ܚܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒ ܐܕܘܗܝ.
ܠܐܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܒܝ ܪ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܥܘܬܗ.

---

350. ܐܦ] above line C — 357. stich in marg. E — 367. ܐܝܟ] before corr. prec. by ܒܬܕܡܝܢ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ (hom.) B

ܠܥܘܠܐ ܕܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܡܥܪܪܝܢ ܒܠܥܕ ܬܪܝܢ ܥܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܘܡܚܘܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܗܪܟܐ ܛܟܣܐ ܕܕܚܝ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܝ ܠܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܪܘܡ ܐܦ ܪܘܡ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܒܟܠ ܟ̈ܠܠܝ ܗܕܐ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܢܚܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܟܘܬܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܚ̈ܝܝܗܘܢ ܢܗܘܕܘܢ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܟܠ ܫ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܟܠܗ ܒܢܝܐ ܡܠܟܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܒܪ̈ܟܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ.
ܘܐܝܟ ܒܪ̈ܟܐ ܗܘܘ ܚܝ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܢ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܪܦܐ ܡܢ ܬܘܟܠܢܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܐ ܡܠܝ̈ܟܐ.
ܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܒܠ ܢܛܪ ܒܪ̈ܟܐ ܠܟܝܢ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܓܒܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܦܨ̈ܪܐ ܘܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܬܠܬܐ.
ܒܦܪ̈ܨܐ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܐܪܡܝܘ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܬܪܝܢܐ ܚܕ ܒܪ̈ܟܐ ܘܣܗܕܐ ܒܫܪܪܐ.
ܣܗܕܐ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܚܝܪ ܒܪ̈ܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܣܗܕ ܥܠ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܓܢܣܗ.
ܠܣܗܕܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܪܒܥܐ ܟܠ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ:
ܘܬܠܬܐܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܛܥܝܢ ܥܛܪ ܣܘܟܠܐ.
ܥܛܪܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܓܒܠ ܒܪܘܝܐ ܒܗ ܠܗ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܛܥܡܗ ܒܛܥܡܐ ܐܪ̈ܥܢܝܐ ܘܫܡܝܢܐ.
ܬܠܬܐ ܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܓܒܐ ܒܗ ܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܒܥܛܪ ܫܢ̈ܝ:
ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐܝܬ ܡܥܝܢܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ.
ܡܥܝܢܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ ܛܒܥܗ ܒܕܡܗ ܠܥܛܪ ܫܢ̈ܝ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܥܕܪ ܡܗܠܟ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܟܠܗ ܓܢܣܗ.
ܒܡܬܘܬܗ ܚܙܪ ܡܢ ܒܕܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܘܡܚܘܬܐ:
* f. 251v ܘܒܢܘܚܡܗ ܡܠܝܟ ܠܝ * ܫ̈ܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܥܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܝܘܗ ܒܬܪ ܡܘܬܗ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ܣܗܕܐ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܠܓܢܣܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܓܒܝܗܝ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܪܝܡ ܗܪ ܠܗ ܠܥܠ ܪܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ.
ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܛܥܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܓܒܝܗ ܠܥܠ ܡܢܗ:
ܐܠܐ ܒܛܥܡܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܛܥܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܦܘܫܩܐ.

---

386. ܘܣܗ̈ܕܐ] om. sey. D | ܒܪ̈ܟܐ] before corr. foll. by ܗܘܘ ܚܝ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܢ (hom.) — 387. ܘܐܝܟ] om. ܘ BCDE — 399. ܒܥܛܪ] ܒܐܥܛܪ BCDE — 409. ܓܒܝܗ] corr. from ܓܒܗ

ܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܦܘܚܡܐ ܠܕܪܓܐ ܕܣܩ ܒܗ ܪܥܝܢܟ ܚܢܘܟ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܫܩܐ ܪܥܝܢܘܬܗ ܒܡ ܕܟܬ̈ܒܐ.
ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܥܒܕܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܕܐܢܫ ܒܡܠ̈ܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܠܦܘܫܗ ܓܒܪ: ܐܝܟ ܕܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܐܠܝܐ.
ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܡܢ ܝܕ: ܐܢܫܐ ܣܗܕ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܘܐܥܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܐܪܥܐ.
ܒܐܪܥܐ ܒܒܪܝܢ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܒܚܒܫܐ ܕܡܫܘܬܬܐ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ.
ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܒܗ ܟܠܗ ܥܘܬܪܐ ܠܚܒܝܒܘ:
ܐܝܟܐ ܕܒܚܒܪ ܐܕܡ ܪܥܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܚܢܘܟ.
ܐܕܡ ܕܬܐܡ ܬܪܥܗ ܠܥܘܪܐ ܕܟܐܦ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܥܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܗܘܐ ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢܐ.
ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢܐ ܟܠܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܬܪܐ:
ܥܕܡܐ ܕܥܪܩܗܝ ܚܕ ܟܐܢܐ ܘܥܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܚܕ ܟܐܢܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܓܠ ܠܗ ܠܦܘܪܩ:
ܘܦܬܚ ܡܥܠܬܗ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܬܪ ܢܦ̈ܩܬܐ.
ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܟܠܐ ܗܘܘ ܚܠܝܡܝܢ: ܒܦܓܪ ܘܒܪܘܚ:
ܘܐܬܚܙܝܘ ܒܗ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܡܥܒܪ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ.
ܡܥܒܪ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܓܠ ܠܗ ܠܦܘܪܩ ܒܪܘܚ ܠܐ ܒܦܓܪ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܡܢܗ ܘܥܠܗ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܡܢܗ.
ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܪܘܡܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܪܘܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܪܥܝܢܟ:
ܠܦܪܕܝܣ ܡܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܕܠܐ ܕܫܬ ܠܗ ܪܓܠܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܓܠ ܕܒܗ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܡܢ:
ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܕܟܐ ܡܢ ܢܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܘܡܢ ܡܚܒ̈ܠܢܐ.
ܒܕܡܟܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ ܐܦ ܚܕܐ ܐܦ ܥܠܬ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ:
ܘܦܫܩ ܕܟܢܫܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ ܣܠܩ ܥܠ ܒܬ̈ܝܢ.
ܣܠܩ ܥܠ ܒܬ̈ܝܢ ܚܢܘܟ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܘܡܟܠܗ ܠܡܘܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܦܘܪܥܢܐ ܣܠܩ ܡܢ̈ܬܐ.
ܚܘܠܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܚܬܡܗ ܠܟܠܗܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܓܢܐ ܠܚܟܐ ܘܐܬܚܝܗ ܒܡܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܟܐܢܐ.
ܒܗ ܒܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܓܠ ܒܗ ܡܘܬܐ ܘܫܒܠ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܒܗ ܟܠܐ ܚܛ̈ܗܐ ܘܒܛܠ ܡܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ.

---

417. ܒܐܪܥܐ] ܪ above line D — 422. ܐܢܫܐ] ܐܢܘܢ BCDE — 442. ܘܒܛܠ] del. and add. again in marg.

ܐܕܡ ܕܪܫܗ̇ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܒܪ ܟܠ ܦܐܪܐ:
ܘܓܒܪ ܡܘܬܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܒܢܝܐ ܐܕܡܝܐ.
ܥܒܪ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܡܥܒܕܘܬ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܘܒܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܚܐܡ ܚܢܘܟ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܡܥܪܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܓܠܐ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܓܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܕܣܗܕܝܢ ܠܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܣܗܕܝܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܪܥܝܬ ܚܝ̈ܝܢ ܠܟܠ ܒܥܡܠܐ ܡܥܕܪ ܚܝ̈ܝܢ.
ܬܪܝܢ ܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܣܗܕܝܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܥܠ ܚܘܒܬ:
ܘܚܕ ܒܥܡܠܐ ܡܫܠܡ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܘܕܐܠܗܘܬ.
ܬܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܡܦܝܣܝܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܚܕ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܫܪܐ ܒܥܡܠܐ ܘܦܩܕ ܒܐܪܥܐ.
ܠܘ ܒܡ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܡܫܝܚܗ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܡܠܟ ܡܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܗ ܐܝܟ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܠܘ ܟܐܢܐ * ܫܒܝܚܐ ܦܪܘܩܗ ܐܝܟ ܟܐܢܐ: * f. 252r
ܘܠܐ ܠܦܘܫܗ ܐܝܟ ܫܘܝܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܣܪܐ.
ܠܐ ܢܬܒܠܠܘܢ ܗ̈ܕܝܘܛܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢܝܢ:
ܕܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܣܒ ܐܢܐ ܠܡܬܠ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܒܠܒܠܝܗܘܢ.
ܡܛܠ ܐܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܟܠܠܐ ܡܪܒܒܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܝ̈ܕܥܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܛܥܢܐ ܠܗ ܕܡܒܠܐ ܒܢܝܢ ܠܚܝܕ ܟ̈ܠܐ.
ܟ̈ܠܐ ܝܕܝܢ ܝܕ̈ܥܘ ܟ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܐܚܝܢ ܦܬܚ ܐܝܟ ܒܘܦܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܕ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܐ ܡܬܬܚܝܢ ܢܝܐ ܗܡܝܢܘܬ ܒܐܢܝ̈ ܗܟ̈ܠܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܗܦܟܝܢ ܠܡܐܢܝ ܚܝܠܗ ܒܕ̈ܚܝܢܘܗܝ.
ܡܚܝܠܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܠܡܐܢܝ ܕܢܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ:
ܘܒܪܐ ܪܗܛܐ ܕܦܬ ܚܕ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܒܘܫܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܠܡܢ ܕ ܟ̈ܠܐ ܒܟ̈ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܢܝܢ:
ܘܐܦܠܐ ܠܡܬܠ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܚܠܝܐ ܥܠ ܒܫܝ̈ܢܬܐ.
ܒܫܝܢܐ ܡܒܗܘ ܡܬܠܬܐ ܣܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܐܬ ܚܠܝܬ ܒܦܘܡ ܢܒ̈ܝܐ ܬܘܪ ܘܐܬܕܟܪܘ.
ܡܠܬܐ ܚܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܬܢܝܬ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܛܥܢܐ ܠܝ ܕܡܬܬܠܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܗܕܝܘܛܝܬ.

---

455. ܒܡ] ܐܝܟ B(in marg.) CDE

475 ܠܐ ܗܕܝ̈ܘܛܐ ܠܘ ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬ ܡܕܝܢܬ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ:
ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܕ̈ܕܝܢ ܒܕܠܐ ܪܕܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܪܕܘܬ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܡܪܕܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܫܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܡܫ̈ܬܚܩ ܒܝܬ ܡܫ̈ܠܡܢܘܬܗ.
ܒܠܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܡܬܬܩܠܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܐܦܐ:
480 ܘܠܐ ܦܪܚܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܡܪ̈ܘܡܐ ܗܝܟܐ ܡܢ ܢܫܪܐ.
ܥܡܪ ܐܡܪܬ ܒܥܪܒܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܟܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܡܪܡ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܗܡܪܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ:
ܘܫܬܡܥܘ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ.
485 ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܫܠܡ ܘܐܡܠܟ ܠܟܠ ܒܥܡ̈ܡܐ:
ܘܕܪܫ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܡ̈ܝܢܐ.
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܗܡܕܐ ܒܥܠ̈ܝ ܫܡܝܐ:
ܘܐܬܪܡ ܐܝܟܐ ܘܫܬܡܥ ܒܕܡܗ ܕܠܐ ܢܛܪ ܟܠ.
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܐܚܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ:
490 ܘܐܢ ܚܟܝܡܝܢ ܗܕ̈ܝܘܛܐ ܢܡܘܢ ܗܟܢ.
ܢܡܘܢ ܗܟܢ ܒܕܡܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܪܥܝܘܗܝ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ:
ܘܢܠܠ ܒܥܡܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܘܠܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܢ.
ܡܢܝܐܬ ܐܬܠܠ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܠ ܡܦܘܠܬܗ:
ܘܗܟܢ ܕܒܪܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܡܝ̈ܕܐ ܠܕܘܟ ܕܪܟܐ.
495 ܠܪܒܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܟܐ ܗܕܝܘܛܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܡܝܢ ܕܢܫܒ ܚܟܝܡܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܡܠ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܠܫܘܠܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܢܦܠܝܢ ܠܥܠ ܒܗܪܟܐ ܒܢܫܐ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܘܡܫܬܐܠܐ ܦܡܪܘ ܘܐܫܬܐܠܘ.
ܥܠ ܦܡܪܬܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܥܡܡܐ ܠܕܐܥܠܐ ܡܪܘܡܗ:
500 ܘܠܐ ܡܫܒ ܠܕܐܥܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܪܢܝܢܐ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܢܫܐ ܗܫܐ ܪܚܝܡܘܗܝ ܡܕܡ ܫܡܥܬ:
ܘܡܦܠܓ ܠܟ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܚܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܠܐܪ̈ܐ ܕܡܠܬ.
ܒܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܪܓܫ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܡܚܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܥܠܕܪ̈ܝܢ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܥܠܝܡ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܠ̈ܬ.
505 ܒܗܪܟܐ ܕܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܗܪܟܐ ܠܡܬܗ ܟܗ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܗܪܟܬ ܒܗ ܚܒܝܒ ܘܠܐ ܕܗܕܝܘܛܐ.

---

484. ܘܫܬܡܥܘ] read ܘܫܬܡܥ as BCDE — 486. ܥܡ̈ܝܢܐ] corr. in marg. from ܥܡܝܢܐ B — 499. ܥܡܡܐ] ܐ del. and restored B — 505. ܒܗܪܟܐ] sey. E — 506. ܘܡܢܐ] ܡܢܐ D

ܥܠܘ ܡܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܡܚܝܬ ܝ ܐܕܝܢܘܢ ܒܟܠ ܐܡ̈ܡܬܐ:
ܘܒܟܐ ܕܡܒܪܬ ܕܡܫܠܐ ܥܠܝܡ ܥܓܠܒܘ * ܘܐܬܒܪܪܘ. * f. 252v
ܠܥܓܠܒܘܬܗܘܢ ܚܝܠܬ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܥܒܕܐ:
510 ܘܥܡܝܩܬ ܡܠܬܝ ܕܐܒܐܐ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܕ ܠܒܕܦ̈ܢܘܗܝ.
ܠܒܕܦ̈ܢܘܗܝ ܕܡܠܒܕܦ̈ܢܐ ܒܡܕܬ ܡܠܬܝ:
ܘܥܡܝܩܬ ܡܠܬܗ ܘܐܪܕܬ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܥܓ̈ܠܐ.
ܠܥܓ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗܬ ܒܥܘܠܦ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ:
ܘܠܠܐ ܪܕܝܐ ܪܕܝܬ ܒܦܫܛܐ ܕܥܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
515 ܥܪܝܐܬ ܐܡܪܬ ܐܝܟ ܠܥܪܝ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܒܠܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܚܝܬ ܕܐܬܒܠܥܘ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܪܒܝܬ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܐ ܓܠܐ ܒܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܠܕܠܐ ܓ̈ܠܝܢ.
ܠܠܐ ܓܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܒܣܚܬ ܕܐܫܬܒܚܐ ܡܕܡ ܥܡܝ̈ܩܬܐ:
520 ܘܐܘܕܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܕܝܢ ܙܢ̈ܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ.
ܙܢ̈ܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ ܒܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܥܪܒܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬ:
ܠܘ ܠܓܒܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܠܥܒ̈ܕܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܕ̈ܘܒܪܐ.
ܠܠܐ ܡܕ̈ܘܒܪܐ ܓܠܝܬ ܓ̈ܠܠܬܐ ܕܥܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܒܠܬܐ ܕܥܢܘ ܡܢ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
525 ܠܐܬܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܥܢܘ ܡܢ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܒܥܘܢܗܘܢ ܝ ܪܘ ܠܝ ܠܦܘܫܐ ܕܥܢܘ ܚܝ̈ܝܢ.
ܚܝ̈ܐ ܫܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܐܥܠܘܗܝ ܠܝ ܪܫܡ ܒܗܘܢ:
ܘܢܬܠܡ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܠܒ̈ܒܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ:
530 ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܕ ܠܟ ܐܠܐ ܒܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܚܢܐ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܒܦܓܪ ܘܒܪܘܚ:
ܕܪ ܠܟ ܠܐ ܥܘܐ ܒܕܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܚܒ̈ܕܐ ܠܡܪܐ.
ܚܒ̈ܕܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܒܗܟܐ ܐ ܚܝܝܢ:
ܡܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܟܠ ܟܠ ܒܗܟܐ ܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘ.
535 ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܪ ܢܘܚܐ:
ܡܥܡܝܢܐ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܕܡ ܘܡܒܠܝ ܡܢ ܡܝܬܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܒܗܝ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܒܠܝܘܕܗܘܢ ܡܟܠܗ ܠܗܕܐ ܫܠܦ ܡܝܬܘ̈ܬܐ.

---

508. ܥܓܠܒܘ] corr. in marg. from ܥܓܠܘ C, ܥܓܠܘ B(corr. to ܥܓܠܒܘ and restored) E — 520. ܙܢ̈ܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) B — 524. ܗܝ] above line D ¦ ܒܠܬܐ] above line B

475 ܠܐ ܗܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܗ ܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܡܪܢܝܬ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ:
ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܕܕܡܝ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܕܡܝ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܒܪܘܚܬ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܕܡܝ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܫܘܝܢ ܒܚܕ ܫܘܚܠܦܗ.
ܒܠܐ ܒܘܢܝܐ ܡܬܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܐܦܐ:
480 ܘܠܐ ܦܪܝܫܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܡܚܣܪ ܗܢܝܐ ܡܢ ܢܦܫܗ.
ܥܦܪ ܐܡܪܬ ܒܥܪܒܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܥܠ ܒܪܝܫܐ:
ܕܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܪܚܡ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܒܪܝ ܗܒܪܐ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ:
ܘܫܬܩܘ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܣܘܦ ܘܐܠܦܐ.
485 ܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܦܠܛ ܘܐܡܠܟ ܠܟܠ ܒܥܡܡܐ:
ܘܩܪܐ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܥܡܝ̈ܢܐ.
ܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܗܕܪܐ ܒܥܠܡ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܐܡܪ ܐܚܕܐ ܘܫܬܩܗ ܒܕܡܗ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܙ ܟܠ.
ܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܪܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ:
490 ܘܐܢ ܣܡܝܬܝܢ ܗܕܘܡܝܐ ܢܡܢܘܢ ܫܡܫܐ.
ܢܡܢܘܢ ܫܡܫܐ ܒܪܡܫܐ ܕܫܩܠ ܪܗܛܗܘܢ ܠܥܠܡܐ:
ܘܢܫܠܠ ܒܡܕܡܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܕܗܕܡ ܡܢ.
ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ ܐܫܠܠ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܥܠ ܡܦܩܬܗ:
ܘܫܡܫܐ ܕܢܚܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܡܝ̈ܕܐ ܠܕܘܗ ܕܢܚܐ.
495 ܠܢܦܐ ܡܫܠܡ ܕܡܢ ܡܬ̈ܠܐ ܗܕܘܡܝܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܟܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܚ ܣܡܝܢ ܒܡܠ ܡܠܬ̈ܗܘܢ.
ܠܫܘܠܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܫܠܕܝܢ ܠܥܩܒ ܒܬܪ ܟܠܗ ܒܢܝܐ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘ ܩܠܐ ܕܟܠܬ ܡܫܬܥܐ ܦܘܪ ܘܐܫܬܥܝܘ.
ܡܠ ܦܘܪܩܢܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܫܡܥܐ ܠܝ ܕܐܫܬܠܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ:
500 ܘܠܐ ܡܫܒ ܠܝ ܕܐܥܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܪܢܝܢܐ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܢܫܐ ܗܫܡ ܪܚܡܘܗܘܢ ܡܕܡ ܣܘܥܒܕ:
ܘܡܟܪܟ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܫܚܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܟܪܟܪܐ ܕܡܠܬ.
ܒܬ̈ܠܐ ܪܓܠܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܡܫܚܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܟܠܒ̈ܢܝ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܥܠܝܡ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܘܬܐ ܕܠܡܦܠ ܡܠܬ.
505 ܒܗܪ ܟܐ ܕܬ̈ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܗܪ ܟܐ ܠܡܬܘܗ ܟܢܘ:
ܘܡܟܐ ܕܗܪ ܟܬ ܒܗ ܚܘܒܝ ܘܠܐ ܕܗܕܘܡܝܐ.

---

484. ܘܫܬܩܘ] read ܘܫܬܩ as BCDE — 486. ܥܡܝ̈ܢܐ] corr. in marg. from ܥܡܝܢܐ B — 499. ܫܡܥܐ] ܐ del. and restored B — 505. ܒܗܪ ܟܐ] sey. E — 506. ܘܡܟܐ] ܡܟܐ D

ܥܠܘ ܡܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܣܝܒ ܡܢ ܐܪܕܘܗܝ ܒܟܠ ܐܫܟܡܬܢ:
ܘܡܟܐ ܕܗܡܪܬ ܕܡܥܠܐ ܥܠܝܡ ܥܩܒܘ * ܘܐܬܒܚܪܘ. * f. 252v
ܠܥܩܒܬܗܘܢ ܚܙܝܬ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܥܘܪܐ:
510 ܘܫܡܥܬ ܡܠܬ، ܕܐܒܐ ܒܬ̈ܠܐ ܕ ܠܒܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܒ̈ܪܝܗܘܢ ܕܡܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܒܗܕܐ ܡܠܬ:
ܘܫܡܥܬ ܡܠܬܗ ܘܪܕܝܬ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠܝܠ̈ܐ.
ܠܟ̈ܠܝܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܬ ܒܥܘܠܦ ܬ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ:
ܘܠܠܐ ܙܕܩܐ ܙܪܝܬ ܒܦܣܩܐ ܕܫܪܝܪܬܐ.
515 ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܡܪܬ ܐܝܟ ܠܫܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ:
ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ، ܟܠܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܦܠܛ ܡܘܬܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܣܢܝܬ ܕܐܬܟܠܝ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܚܒܒܬ ܬ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܟܠܐ ܒܬ̈ܠܐ ܠܕܠܐ ܟܠܝܢ.
ܠܐ ܟܠܝܬܐ ܒܣܝܒܬ ܕܐܫܬܒܚܐ ܡܕܡ ܫܡܘ̈ܥܐ:
520 ܘܐܘܕܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܕܡܝܢ ܙܢܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ.
ܙܢܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ ܒܡܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܥܪܒܐ ܕܗܘܠܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬ:
ܠܘ ܠܡܚܪ̈ܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܠܡܒܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܒܪܐ.
ܠܠܐ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܟܠܝܬ ܬ̈ܠܠܬܐ ܕܫܘܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ، ܟܠܬܐ ܕܫܝܚܘ ܡܢ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
525 ܠܐܬܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܫܝܚܘ ܡܢ ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ:
ܘܒܫܘܚܠܦܗܘܢ ܦܪ ܠܝ ܠܦܘܣܩܐ ܕܫܘܝ ܚܝ̈ܢ.
ܚܝ̈ܐ ܚܕ̈ܬܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ، ܠܝ ܪܢܝܢ ܠܥܠܡ:
ܘܢܬܠܡ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܟܠܒ̈ܝܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܬܠܬ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
530 ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܕܪ ܟܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܟܠܒܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܢܝܐ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܒܦܠܝܚ ܘܒܪܘܚ:
ܕܪܟܐ ܠܐ ܐܘܫܐ ܒܕܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܒ̈ܕܐ ܠܡܪܐ.
ܒܒ̈ܕܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܣܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܒܡܟܐ ܐ ܚܝܢ:
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܠ ܒܠ ܒܡܟܐ ܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘ.
535 ܚܢܘܟ ܘܐܠܝܐ ܒܐܪܒܐ ܢܛܪܝܢ ܒܕ ܢܘܫܡܐ:
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܪܡ ܘܡܒܠܥ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ.
ܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܒܗ، ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ، ܡܒܠܥ ܠܗܕܐ ܚܠܦ ܡܘܬܐ.

---

508. ܥܩܒܘ] corr. in marg. from ܥܩܒ C, ܥܩܒ B(corr. to ܥܩܒܘ and restored) E — 520. ܙܢܝ ܒܡܫ̈ܬܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) B — 524. ܗܝ،] above line D | ܟܠܬܐ] above line B

ܫܠܦ ܡܫܬܘ̈ܬܐ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܗ̇، ܒܪܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܡܫܬܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܬܚܠܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܒ̈ܪܝܐ ܘܕܟ̈ܠ ܫܐܕ̈ܐ.
ܒܪ̈ܝܐ ܗܘ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܒܗ̇، ܕܒܚ̈ܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܒܪܘܝܐ:
ܘܬܘܒ ܐܦ ܡܪܐ ܗܘ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܕܢ ܠܟܐ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܢ ܠܗ ܕܢܩ ܡܢ ܟܠܐ:
ܘܢܝܪ ܘܐܡܠܟܗ ܠܗ ܒܒܢܘܗܝ ܐܠܐ ܒܕܢ ܠܗ.
ܒܕܢ ܠܗ ܢܝܪ ܗܘ̇ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܗܕܐ ܒܠܗ̇ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܟܐ ܗܘ̇ ܕܝܢ ܟܐ ܒܗ.
ܐܠܗ ܟܠܐ ܝܢ ܟܐ ܕܢܒܢܘܗܝ، ܒܫܡ ܪܒܘܬܗ:
ܘܗܐ ܫܒܝܚܝܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܠܠܐ ܒܪܒܘܬ ܕܢ ܠܗ.
ܐܪܐ ܗܠܠܐ ܠܗܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܗܘ ܒܠ ܘܪܗܒܡ:
ܘܠܐ ܝܢ ܒܡ ܐܢܫܘ ܠܡܫܡܠܘ ܠܗܠܟܐ ܕܒܝܢ.
ܐܪܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܫܘܘ ܕܡܫܬܘ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ:
ܒܫ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܡ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܝܢ ܓܒܪ ܒܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܦܪܫܗ، ܒܥܒܕܗ ܘܢܛܠܗ ܕܢ ܠܟܐ ܕܥܡ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ.
ܥܒܕܗܐ ܢܛܠܗ ܘܐܦ ܗܘܒܪܝܐ ܕܢܒܝܢ ܒܝܬܗ:
ܘܒܕ ܠܒ ܢܛܠܗ ܠܐ ܠܒܝܫܐ ܠܗ ܕܒܝܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܗ،
ܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܗ، ܘܫܠܦ ܫܢܝ ܦܠܓ ܘܐܬܦܪܫܩ:
ܘܫܒܝܢ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܦܪܩ ܠܒܫܗ.
ܬܘܕܝ، ܠܐܠܗܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܒܠܗ ܒܡ ܡܫܬܘ̈ܬܐ:
* ܕܢܦܪܩ ܠܒܫܗ ܒܫ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܢܦܠ ܡܢ.

* f. 253r

---

541. ܕܒܪ̈ܝܐ] ܕܒܚܝ̈ܪܐ B(corr. from ܕܒܪ̈ܝܐ) CDE — 560. ܕܢܦܠ] ܕܢܦܩ D

Homily II

On the Flood

Sigla of Manuscripts

A = London, British Library, Oriental 5463
B = Leningrad, The Institute of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5
C = London, British Library, Oriental 9367
D = Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55
E = Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 594
I = Teheran, Neesan 1

ܕܝܠܗ ܟܕ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܬܬܥܣܪ. ܕܥܠ ܛܘܒܢܐ.
ܘܡܬܐܡܪ ܒܢ ܘܡܐ.
ܒܢܘܚܐ. ܒܪܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܫܠܦ ܒܡܪܐ ܕܐܪܒܐ. ܝܗܒ ܠܢ
ܠܡܫܠܡܘܬܗ ܒܡܪܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. ܐܡܝܢ.

ܚܣܝܢ ܘܡܫܒܚ ܒܪܘܚܐ:
ܕܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܦܩ ܟܠ.
ܘܚܘܝ ܚܝܠܗ ܒܒܪ̈ܝܬܗ;
ܕܐܡܪ ܘܐܬܐ ܠܗܘܝܐ܀
ܒܫܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܒܥܒܕܬܗ:
ܩܕܡ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܗ.
ܘܓܠܝܗ, ܚܘܒܗ ܠܢ ܒܢܝܗ:
ܘܐܫܦܥ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܡܘܗܒܬܗ܀
ܒܠܒܫܐ ܐܦܩ ܟܠܡܕܡ:
ܘܠܐ ܥܒܕ ܡܕܡ ܚܣܝܪܐ.
ܕܒܚܝܠܗ ܓܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ;
ܓܒܪ ܬܘܩܢܗ ܘܡܫܟܠ܀
ܙܒܢܐ ܦܫܝܛ ܗܘܐ ܒܥܒܕܬܗ:
ܕܐܝܟ, ܢܒܪܐ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܘܒܫܡܐ ܗܘܬ ܦܪܘܣܛܓܡܐ:
ܥܡ ܚܫܘܬܐ ܕܚܣܝܢܗ܀
ܓܠܐ ܒܚܫܘܬܗ * ܒܒܪ̈ܝܬܗ; * f. 92v
ܘܚܘܝ ܚܝܠܗ ܒܬܘܩܢܗ.
ܘܡܚܐ ܠܗ ܒܢ̈ܝܢ ܙܘܥܐ:
ܫܒܝܚ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܒܟܠ ܕܒܪܐ܀
ܟܕ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܒܒ̈ܪܝܬܗ;
ܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܠܐܟܐ.
ܕܚܙܘ ܗܘ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܦܩ ܟܠ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܠܥܕܘܗ,܀

Title. ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ܀ ܕܥܠ ܛܘܒܢܐ܀ BCE, ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܟܕ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܡܪܝ ܢܪܣܝ: ܕܥܠ ܛܘܒܢܐ܀ D, add. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܝܘ܀ ܥܠ ܛܘܒܢܐ܀ in marg. AI, add. ܝܘ in marg. D — 2. ܡܕܡ] above line — 15. ܦܪܘܣܛܓܡܐ] ܦܪܣܛܓܡܐ BCDE

ܚܕ ܠܓܘܫܡܐ ܗܘ ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܘܪܟܒ:
ܠܟܠܝ̈ܠܐ ܘܠܫܬܩ̈ܐ.
ܘܐܫܪܗ ܠܟܠܗ ܬܘܩܢܗ:
ܒܪܘܟܒܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܟܗ ܕܐܕܡ✤
ܒܒܕܗ ܠܢ ܠܟܐ ܡܣܝܒܬܐ:
ܕܢܚܘܪܘܢ ܒܗ ܬܘܩܢ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܕܡܢ ܠܟܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܢܚܘܢ:
ܒܡܫܘܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܐ✤
ܡܢ ܠܟܗ ܫܠܦ ܠܟܠܝ̈ܠܐ:
ܕܒܟܐ ܪܫܡ ܬܘܩܢ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܘܒܬܪ ܕܢܚܐ ܕܣܟܠܘܬܐ:
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܪܫܡ ܒܐܘܬܐ ܗܘ✤
ܙܕܩܗ̇ ܠܐܕܡ ܕܒܛܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ:
ܘܐܫܠܡ ܠܡܐܝܢ ܟܠ ܕܒܛܠ.
ܘܗ̇ܘ ܚܘܒܗ ܘܒܐܘܬܗ:
ܕܕܪܐ ܘܦܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܚܒܠ✤
ܗ̇ܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܐܘܬܗ:
ܕܦܢܐ ܒܘܠܐ ܘܚܛܝܬܐ.
ܘܗ̇ܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܛܒܘܬܗ:
ܕܒܟܐ ܪܫܡ ܬܘܩ̈ܢܐ✤
ܐܝܟ ܥܒܕ̈ܐ ܪܚܡ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܒܡܫܐܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܫܠܝܚܐ.
ܘܒܬܪ ܕܢܚܐ ܘܠܘܚܡܐ:
ܦܬܚ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܝܕܥܬܐ✤
ܒܡܬܠܐ ܕܥܒܪ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ:
ܢܓܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܬ̈ܠܐ.
ܘܫܡܐ ܕܬܘܬ ܪܚܡܐ:
ܫܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܠܝܬܐ✤
ܦܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܚܢܢܐ:
ܟܕ ܓܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܙܘܥܐ.
ܟܕ ܡܬܚܫܬ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܗܘܢ:
ܒܡܘܬ̈ܐ ܘܕܡܘܬ̈ܐ✤

---

25. ܗܘ ܠܓܘܫܡܐ] written ܘ ܠܓܘܫܡܐ A, ܗܘ non-enclitic BCDE, om ܗܘ I | ܗܘܐ] in marg. A, om. BCDE — 29. ܠܢ ܠܟܐ] ܠܢ ܠܟܗ BCDE — 38. ܠܡܐܝܢ] before corr. foll. by ܘܠܛܠܐ B — 41. ܐܢܘܢ] before corr. repeated (dit.) — 48. ܐܢܘܢ] in marg. B

ܟܕ ܚܕ ܕܐܫܦܪ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܐܦܠܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܚܘܒܗ.
ܘܟܕ ܫܒܪܐ ܕܫܘܚܗ:
ܦܓܗ ܠܟܢܬܐ ܕܪ̈ ܓܒܝܐ✤
ܒܚܘܒܟ ܕܫܦܪ ܘܐܫܬܠܝ:
ܗ̇ܘ ܚܘܒܗ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܗܘܢ.
ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܚܢܢܐ ܗܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܠܒܘܠܐ ܘܠܚܛܝܬܐ✤
ܒܚܢ̈ܢܐ ܢܛܪܗ ܠܕܢܚܐ:
ܕܒܪܝ ܒܗ ܒܘܛܠ ܡܬܠܬܐ.
ܘܡܫܘܚܗ ܓܠܝܟ ܫܢ̈ܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ✤
ܗ̇ܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܚܘܒܗ ܒܚܘܒܟ:
ܕܫܛܘܗܝ ܠܡܪܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܟܘܗܝ.
ܘܒܟܠܐ ܕܡܟܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ:
ܡܢ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܠܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܢܓܕܘܗܝ✤
ܒܚܘܒܟ ܥܠ ܒܐܘܬܗ:
ܘܫܠܦ ܪܘܓܙܗ ܠܚܢܢܐ.
ܘܒܪܘܫܡܐ ܕܪ̈ ܓܒܝܬܐ:
ܛܠܡܗܝ ܠܚܫܦܗ ܠܬܒܥܬܐ✤
ܫܒܩ ܒܘܠܐ ܕܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ:
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܕܬܗܘܡܐ.
ܘܛܦܬ ܟܠܗ̇ ܒܚܛܝܬܐ:
ܡܕܡ ܛܘܦܢܐ ܕܒܐܘܬܐ✤
ܒܪ ܓܘ ܦܓܪܐ ܐܫܬܚܢܘ:
ܘܟܠܟܠ ܛܥܡܐ ܕܚܝܐ.
ܘܐܝܟ ܚܘܬܐ ܠܚܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܕܡܪܘ ܘܟܠܟܠ ܠܚܕ̈ܪܐ✤
ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܙܒܢܐ ܒܗܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܡܢ ܗܘܠ ܟܠ ܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܫܢ̈ܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܢܬܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܫܘܬܦܗ̇:
ܘܠܐ ܓܒܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܬ ܙܘܓܗ✤

---

76. ܠܚܫܦܗ] ܚܫܦܗ BCDE — 81. ܐܫܬܚܢܘ] ܐܫܬܚܢܢܘ BCDE

ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܪܘܢܐ ܕܪܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܒܪ ܓܠܬܐ ܕܪ ܓܠܬ ܘܬܪ̈ܥܐ.
ܘܒܠܒܢܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܢܫ̈ܬܐ:
ܠܒܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܪ̈ܚܝܡܘܗܝ܀
ܓܥ ܡܚܒܠܐ ܕܚܛܝܬܐ:
ܘܪܘܦ ܪܘܡܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܛܘܪܐ.
ܘܡܫܒܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܝܡܐ:
ܕܢܫܐ ܠܢܫܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ܀
ܦܪܚܬ ܒܪܦܠܐ ܕܛܘܒܝܢ:
ܘܒܗܬܬ ܐܦ̈ܝܗ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ.
ܘܛܦܛܦܘ ܘܪܒܒܘ ܙܗ̈ܪܝܐ:
ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܪܬܒܢܝܬܐ܀
ܒܫܥܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܐܬܛܒܥ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܪ ܓܒܘ ܕܒܪ ܫܠܝܚ.
* f. 93r
ܘܟܕ ܕܪ̈ܚܝܡܘܗܝ * ܠܐ ܕܚܝܢ:
ܕܒܒܘ ܘܚ̈ܝܐ ܥܡ ܗܕ̈ܡܐ܀
ܚܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐ ܐܬܛܒܥ:
ܒܫܥܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܥܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ.
ܕܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܒ̈ܢܝ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܙܕܩܗ ܠܥܢܬܐ ܕܚܛܝܬܐ܀
ܢܘܚ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܚܝ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܛܒܥܐ ܦܓܪܗ ܒܥܘܠܐ.
ܕܐܝܟ ܠܩ̈ܒܐ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܘܩ̈ܒܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܛܒܥ ܒܚܛܝܬܐ܀
ܠܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܚܢܦܘܬ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܬܛܪܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܒܠܥ̈ܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܬܢܝܚ ܒܗ ܙܪܪܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܒܡܛܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ܀
ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܪܚܝܡܗ:
ܟܦܐ ܠܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܕ̈ܡܘܗܝ.
ܘܠܟܝܢܗ ܦܪܘܫܘܬܐ:
ܠܒܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ̈ܠܐ ܕܚܛܝܬܐ܀

---

96. ܕܢܫܐ ܠܢܫܐ] ܕܢܫܢܫܐ BCDE — 111. ܠܩ̈ܒܐ] ܠܢܩ̈ܒܐ BCDE

ܘܕܒܛܪ ܥܩܘܬ ܕܝܢܐ:
ܘܐܪܡ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܢ ܥܘܠܐ.
ܓܘܐ ܠܓܠ̈ܠܐ ܙܘܥܢܐ:
ܕܡܒܕܩܝܢ ܘܪܡܫܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ܀
ܒܓܠ̈ܠܐ ܛܠܠ ܥܡܗ:
ܘܐܣܗܕ ܥܠ ܕܒܘܬ ܢܦܫܗ.
ܘܪܫܡ ܠܗ ܕܒܡܒܘܠܐ:
ܡܥܝܟ ܠܗ̇ ܠܐܪܒܐ ܡܢ ܥܘܠܐ܀
ܒܫܥܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܒܬܡܗܬܗ:
ܠܢܫܬܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ.
ܗܐ ܡܥܝܟ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ̇ ܒܛܘܦܢܐ:
ܘܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܠܝ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇܀
ܐܢܬ ܠܡ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܟ ܕܒܢܬ:
ܫܡܥܬܢܝ ܡܢ ܗܢ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܛܒܥܐ ܙܕܝܩܝ:
ܒܗܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܗ̇ ܕܐܪܒܐ܀
ܕܠܐ ܚܛܝܬ ܚܘܒܝܢ ܥܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܒܚܢܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܒܥܝܬܐ.
ܐܢܬ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܟ ܡܬܦܨ ܡܢܝ:
ܡܢ ܬܒ̈ܥܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ܀
ܓܠܐ ܘܪܫܡ ܠܗ ܠܬܡܝܡܐ:
ܥܠ ܙܘܥܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝ ܥܡܗ.
ܕܗܐ ܡܦܩܪܐ ܠܗ ܒܐܝܬܘܬܐ:
ܠܚܝܐ ܕܡܥܒܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ܀
ܓܠܐ ܠܗ ܥܘܠܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝ ܥܡܗ:
ܕܐܬܚܠܛܘ ܒܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܐܝܢ.
ܕܦܪܫܝܢ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܒܪܗ:
ܒܓܙܪ ܕܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܘܝܐ܀
ܒܠܛ ܙܪܥܗ ܕܫܝܬ ܙܕܝܩܐ:
ܒܛܘܗܡܗ ܕܩܐܝܢ ܩܛܘܠܐ.
ܘܢܚܬܘ ܕܡܐ ܠܥܩܠܘܬܐ:
ܕܐܫܬܘܬܦܘ ܥܡ ܥܘ̈ܠܐ܀

---

131. ܠܗ̇] above line D — 136. ܕܥܘܠܗ̇] erasure in text and add. in marg. C — 144. ܡܥܒܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ] corr. from ܡܥܒܪ̈ܢܗܝ A, ܡܥܒܪ̈ܢܗܝ I

ܚܙܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܗ̣ܝ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܠܓܠܝ̈ܠܐ ܘܦܓܪܘ ܐܢܘܢ.
ܘܡܫܦܪܐ ܕܐܦ̈ܐ ܦܐܝ̈ܬܐ:
ܢܦܠ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ܀
ܚܘ ܠܗ̇ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ:
ܠܒܢ̈ܬ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܫܦܝܪ̈ܢ.
ܘܪܓܘ ܐܢܝܢ ܘܢܣܒܘ ܐܢܝܢ:
ܘܐܘܠܕܘ ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ ܕܒܥܠܡܐ܀
ܠܘ ܙܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝ̈ܚܘܬܐ:
ܡܟܐ ܕܢܚܬܘ ܒܪܘܡܐ.
ܪ̈ܒܘܬ ܚܝܠܐ ܐܟܬܒܘ ܠܝ:
ܕܐܬܓܢܒܪܘ ܥܠ ܒܢ̈ܬܐ܀
ܦܬܘ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܬ ܩܐܝܢ:
ܢܒܥܐ ܗܢܝܐ ܕܣܛܢܘܬܐ.
ܘܐܦܠܛ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܙܕܝܩܐ:
ܒܡܒܘܠܐ ܕܪ ܓܒܬ ܦܓܪ̈ܐ܀
ܗܘ ܓܒܪ̈ ܒܫܡܐ ܒܢ̈ܬ ܡܠܘܠܐ:
ܘܐܪ̈ܘܝ ܒܬܓܪܗ ܠܫܦܝܪ̈ܐ.
ܘܕܠܝ̈ܢܗܝ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܕܣܒ̈ܝܐ:
ܒܝܕ ܡܟܪܬܐ ܕܐܦ̈ܝܗܝܢ܀
ܘܕܫܘܒܐ ܙܢܝܐ ܒܡܣܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܢܫܬܘ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܕܬܫܢ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܗܠܡ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܒܪ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܐܣܬܗ̇ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܠܒܝܫܘܬܐ܀
ܕܠܐ ܡܦܝܣ ܒܡܒܒܬܗ:
ܕܒܡܕܢܚܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܦܪܕܝܣܐ.
ܓܪܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܒܘܠ ܚܝܠܐ:
ܘܡܠܟܬ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ܀
ܘܐܬܬܘܝ ܕܒܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܢܚܠܘ ܘܫܪܘ ܠܡܥܡ̈ܩܘܗܝ.[...]
ܠܐ ܗ̤ܘܐ ܬܘܬܐ ܐܕܪܥܬܗ:
ܠܚܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܥܠ ܡ̈ܢܝܢ.

---

154. ܘܦܓܪܘ] read ܘܦܓܪ as BCDE — 163. ܐܟܬܒܘ] read ܐܟܬܒ as BCDE — 170. ܘܐܪ̈ܘܝ] read ܘܐܪܘܝ as BCDE — 182. om. 2(?) stiches ABCDEI

ܠܬܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܫܬܡܥ ܩܠܐ:
ܕܒܪ ܦܢܝ ܡܢ ܚܝܠܐ܀
ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܠܘ̈ܝܚܐ:
ܡܬܡܠܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܢ.
ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܟܐ ܢܬܬܒܪܘܢ:
ܕܡܟܐ * ܕܠܒܡ ܒܫܠܝܬܐ܀

* f. 93v

ܐܝܟ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܡܒܗܡ ܗܘܐ:
ܩܠ ܒܪܘܡܐ ܒܐܕܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܕܗܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܐܪ̈ܥܐ ܕܒܠܒܠܘ ܠܡܒܫ̈ܢ܀
ܬܠܡܝܢ ܐ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܒܩܡ ܦܘܡܕܢܐ ܕܙܘܓܒܐ.
ܘܐܫܬܡܥ ܩܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܚܒܠ:
ܬܒܒܪ ܪܘܚ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܠܚܠܡ܀
ܬܠܠ ܬܘܒ ܩܠܐ ܕܬܝܒܐ:
ܠܘܬ ܢܘܚ ܢܒܝܐ ܘܐܡ̣ܪ ܠܗ.
ܕܢܥܒܕ ܩܒܘܬܐ ܕܩܝܣܐ:
ܕܢܫܬܬܪ ܒܗ ܒܡܒܘܠܐ܀
ܥܒܕ ܠܟ ܩܒܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܘܡܐ:
ܘܫܒܚܝܗ̇ ܒܟܘܦܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܬܠܒܒ.
ܕܬܒܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܫܩ̈ܠܐ:
ܡܟܐ ܕܣܠܩܝܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܒܡ̈ܝܐ܀
ܫܘܡܗ ܐܘܪܟܗ̇ ܘܦܬܝܗ̇:
ܕܒܟܐ ܢܥܒܕ ܡܫܘܚܬܗ̇.
ܘܐܠܦ ܦܘܠܚ ܡܕܢܝ̈ܐ:
ܕܢܥܒܝܢ ܠܗ ܘܠܫܘ̈ܬܐ܀
ܥܒܕ ܐܘܪܟܐ ܬܠܬ ܡܐܐ ܐܡ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܦܬܝܐ ܚܡܫܝܢ ܐܡ̈ܝܢ.
ܘܬܠܬܝܢ ܐܡ̈ܝܢ ܪܘܡܗ̇:
ܘܡܕܝܪ̈ܐ ܒܓܘ ܡܕܝܪ̈ܝܗ̇܀
ܬܠܬܐ ܡܕܝܪ̈ܝܢ ܬܗܘܐ:
ܕܢܕܝܪܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܥܠ ܓܢܣ̈ܝܢ.

---

188. ܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܢ] ܡܢ ܕܐܝܗܘܢ BCDE -- 203. ܠܟ] corr. in marg. from ܠܗ -- 214. ܘܡܕܝܪ̈ܐ] ܘܡܕ̈ܝܪܐ BCDE

ܚܘܬ ܥܢܢܐ ܘܥܒ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܦܪ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܓܦܐ ܘܐܢܫ̈ܐ܀
ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܠܦܝܢ ܟܠܐ:
ܕܡܠܟ ܦܘܪ̈ܫܐ ܠܕܝܘܢܐ.
ܕܒܗ ܡܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܡܢܗ;
ܡܚܝܡ ܠܗ ܠܗܘܢܝ ܣܘ̈ܥܗ܀
ܡ̱ܢ ܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܛܪܘܗܝ ܠܬܚܘܡܐ:
ܒܡܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܕܟܠ ܕܐܢܫ.
ܘܦܩܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܦܬܪ:
ܕܠܐ ܩܒܘܬܐ ܠܟܠ ܡܕܡ܀
ܠܬܩܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܪ̈ܝܐ:
ܗܘܐ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܩܒܘܬܐ.
ܕܐܬܐܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܢܬܒܘܢ:
ܘܢܕܘܢ ܣܘܟܪ̈ܢܗܘܢ܀
ܒܦܘܠܚܢ ܡܩܫܐ ܫܬܝܩܐ:
ܡ̱ܟܐ ܕܢܚܡ ܠܒܠܬ̈ܠܐ.
ܕܢܐܠܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܬܐ:
ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܡܬܦܠܚܝܢ.
ܫܪ̈ܟܐ ܒܡܠܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܠܒܠܬ̈ܠܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܒܟܠܐ.
ܕܗܐ ܒܬܘܩܢ ܡܬܒܪ̈ܐ:
ܬܩܒܘܬܐ ܐ ܡ̱ܢ ܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܘܢ܀
ܐܝܟ ܒܘܪܐ ܦܟܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܥܠ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܕܩܒܘܬܐ.
ܕܡܘܒܠܗ ܦܝ ܘ ܡܘܪܐ ܕܣܘܟ̈ܪܢܘܢ:
ܕܡܢ̈ܟܐ ܕܐܠܦܘ ܒܣܠܝܬܐ܀
ܬܪ̈ܬܐ ܗܘܘ ܡ̱ܢ ܐܕܡܗܘܢ:
ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܬܘܩܢ ܩܒܘܬܐ.
ܕܫܒܪܗ ܡܘܡܪܐ ܕܚܛ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܟܠ ܒܡܝ̈ܐ܀
ܢܘܚ ܗܘ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ، ܙܕܝܩ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܡܫܡܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܥܠܡܐ.

---

220. ܠܕܝܘܢܐ] corr. in marg. from ܠܕܝܘ̈ܢܐ — 226. ܠܟܠ] ܕܟܠ E — 243. ܡ̱ܢ ܐܕܡܗܘܢ] corr. in marg. from ܡ̱ܢ ܐܕܡܒܘܢ — 245. ܡܘܡܪܐ] corr. from ܠܡܘܡܪܐ

ܟܕ ܡܗܠܟ ܒܗ ܡܪ̈ܝܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܡܬܗܦܟܝܢ ܬܘܩܢܗ܀
ܒܢܐ ܠܗ ܒܝܬܐ ܬܡܝܗܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܢܚܡ ܢܦܫܗ.
ܘܡܛܠ ܒܗܘܢ ܓܠܝܢܐ:
ܕܢܛܪ ܠܗ ܬܘܪܥܢܐ܀
ܐܟܠ ܘܢܣܒܠ ܡܙܘܢܐ:
ܠܗ ܘܠܓܢܣܗ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܘܟܕ ܙܒܢܐ ܢܛܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ:
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܐܡ̱ܪ ܦ ܕܢܥܒܕܬܗ܀
ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܟܘܠܐ ܕܡܫܡܫܘܬܐ:
ܟܢܫ ܘܐܟܠ ܙܕܝܩܐ.
ܕܢܛܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܩ ܗܘܐ:
ܐܘܟܠܐ ܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܙܒܢܐ܀
ܥܠܠ ܗܘ ܡܬܬܪܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܠܡܘܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܦܓܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܘܙܒܢܐ ܕܚܠܗ ܕܒܘܪܐ:
ܢܛܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܟܡ ܡܪܐ܀
ܓܒܪ ܠܡ ܢܘܚ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܦܩܕ:
ܘܡܛܠ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܘܪܐ.
ܕܥܠ ܠܩܒܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܘܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܘܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܥܡ ܕܝܠܗ܀
ܐܟܠ ܒܡܢܝܢ ܚܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܒܢܝܢܐ ܒܡ ܦܪܚܬܐ.
ܠܡܚܘܐ ܙܙܟܐ ܒܐܪܟܐ:
ܕܢܙܕܘܢ ܠܚܫ̈ܐ * ܒܡܘܒܠܐ܀

* f. 94r

ܐܟܠ ܕܟܪ̈ܐ ܘܢܩ̈ܒܬܐ:
ܬܪܝܢ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ ܛܡ̈ܐܐ.
ܘܕܟ̈ܝܐ ܫܒܥܐ ܫܒܥܐ:
ܐܚܕ ܕܟܪ̈ܐ ܘܢܩ̈ܒܬܐ܀
ܠܐ ܢܩܒ ܗܘܐ ܬܡܝܗܐ:
ܠܡܦܪܫ ܛܡ̈ܐܐ ܘܕܟ̈ܝܐ.

---

259. ܗܘܐ] above line B

ܒܕܟܐ ܕܢܘܚܗ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ:
ܟܕ ܡܟܢܫܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܓܢ̈ܣܝܢ❖
ܐܣܓܝ ܘܐܟܠ ܠܕܒ̈ܐ:
ܕܢܟܣܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܡܟܐ ܕܢܦܩ.
ܕܢܦܣ ܠܗ ܕܢܐܟܘܠ ܒܣܪܐ:
ܘܢܣܒ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܥܠܬܐ❖
ܐܘ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܕܟܢܫ ܓܢ̈ܣܐ:
ܡܪ̈ܥܐ ܘܟܘܪ̈ܗܢܐ.
ܘܓܒܝ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܣܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܘܩܕܡ ܢܘܚ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ❖
ܘܗ̇ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܐܥܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܩܕܡ ܐܕܡ ܟܕ ܫܬܩܝܢ.
ܗܘ ܥܒܕ ܘܓܒܝ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܠܬܗ ܕܬܡܗܬܐ❖
ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܘ ܓܢ̈ܣܝܢ ܓܢ̈ܣܝܢ:
ܕܢܓܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ.
ܘܐܬܝ ܕܟܪ̈ܐ ܥܡ ܢܩܒ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܟܪ̈ܐ ܥܡ ܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܘܒܗܠܝܢ❖
ܦܓ̈ܪܐ ܕܥܢܐ ܡܩܪܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܒܦܘܡ ܣܦ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܫܬܩܝܢ.
ܐܪܝܐ ܘܬܘܪܐ ܒܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܙܘܓܗ ܕܢܘܚܐ❖
ܡܪܝܡ ܓܦܐ ܕܦܪܚܬܐ:
ܘܢܣܬܐ ܡܢ ܙܘܡܐ ܠܒܣܡܐ.
ܘܪܗܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܢܗܪ̈ܐ ܘܡ̈ܝܐ:
ܠܥܒܪܐ ܕܬܪܥ ܡܥܠܬܐ❖
ܥܢܢܐ ܪܒܐ ܡܛܠܠ ܗܘܐ:
ܒܬܪܗ ܟܠܗ ܕܙܘܢܐ.
ܕܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܐܟܠܝ ܠܣܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܒܫܘܒܐ ܢܦܩܘ ܠܣܕ̈ܪܐ❖
ܒܗܘܢ ܐܬܚܙܬ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ:
ܕܐܣܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܗ ܕܐܕܡ.

---

303. ܕܦܪ̈ܚܬܐ] add. sey. BCDEI — 309. ܕܓܢ̈ܣܐ] ܘܓܢ̈ܣܐ BCDE

ܕܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܕܡܬܪܘ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ:
ܦܢܘ ܘܐܫܬܥܒܕܘ ܠܐܕܡ̈ ܢܘܚ❖
ܢܦܩ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܠ ܠܒܪܐ:
ܘܟܢܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܕܘܟ.
ܘܟܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ:
ܠܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܦܠܝ̈ܓܐ ܘܐܫܬܠܡܘ❖
ܫܡܥ ܡܢܝ ܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܝܢ:
ܟܕ ܡܬܠܒܒܝܢ ܣܦ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܟܘܗ̇ ܠܓܒܢܐ ܕܐܬܩܢ ܒܗ ܟܠ:
ܘܢܚܘ ܡܢ ܒܟܠܗ ܟܕ ܥܒܕܐ❖
ܬܒܪ ܗ̇ܝ، ܬܘܩܢܗ:
ܠܘܠܦܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܘܗܪܟܐ ܐ ܓܒܪ ܕܢܘܚܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܪܓܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܫܟܠ❖
ܡܟܐ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܠܡܥܒܕܘܬܐ:
ܡܟܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܘܪܐ.
ܕܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܦܢܘ ܡܢ ܚܒܠܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ❖
ܟܬܪ ܢܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܓ̈ܢܣܐ:
ܫܡܥ ܡܢܝ ܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܝܢ.
ܕܡܟܐ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܘܡܥܒܕܢܐ:
ܠܬܡܗܬܐ ܡܣܬܟܐ ܗܘܐ❖
ܡܟܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ:
ܙ̇ܠܡ ܦܘܩܕܢ ܒܒܪܐ.
ܘܫܟܠ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܬܡܗܬܐ:
ܠܟܘ ܡܢ ܥܒܪܐ ܕܟܐܢܘܬܐ❖
ܡܟܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ:
ܐܢܕܢܐ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܢܘܚܝ.
ܘܬܪܒ ܐܢܐ ܡܟܐ ܕܡܟܐ:
ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܚܝ ܗ̇ ܕܪܡܙܐ❖
ܒܫܬܥܣܪܐ ܥܒ̈ܕܝ ܒܪܝܗ ܠܗ:
ܓܠܝܐ ܠܢܘܚ ܒܚܠܡܐ.

---

317. ܘܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ] read ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ as BCDE

345 ܘܒܫܬܡܐܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ܫܠܡܬ:
ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܦܣܩ ܗܘܐ܀
ܒܫܢܬ ܫܬܡܐܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܢܘܚ:
ܠܦܠܓܬ ܣܘܦܐ ܒܐܘܬܐ.
ܘܒܝܢܐ ܕܚܢ̈ܢܐ ܪܚܬܗ:
350 ܠܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܗ̇ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ܀
ܒܫܢܬ ܫܬܡܐܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܢܘܚ:
ܒܢܗ̇ ܡܛܐ ܠܬܚܘܡܗ.
ܘܡܛܐ ܕܠܟܠ ܐܫܬܚܠܦ:
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܓܢܣܐ ܕܚܣܝܘܬܗ.
355 ܒܫܢܬ ܫܬܡܐܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܢܘܚ:
ܗܘܐ ܛܘܦܢܐ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܘܥܠ ܢܘܚ ܘܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܘܒܢ̈ܫܘܗܝ:
ܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ܀
ܡܠܐ ܕܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܘܪܚܗ̇:
360 ܠܡܕܪܬܐ ܥܠ ܡܬܟ̈ܢܘܗ̇.
* f. 94v
ܘܪ̈ܓܫܢܐ ܕܟܝ̈ܢܐ * ܕܠܟܠ:
ܚܦܐ ܐܦܝ̈ܗ̇ ܒܫܡܘܥܐ܀
ܢܘܚ ܘܕܒܝܬܗ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܠܗ̇ܘ ܙܡܪܐ ܕܟܫ ܐܠܘܢ.
365 ܕܢܐܚܘܕ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܩܒܘܬܐ:
ܒܩܠܐ ܕܙܡܪܐ ܕܚܝܠܗ܀
ܬܗܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܚܠܬܐ:[…]
ܕܢܫܬܬܪܘܢ ܡܢ ܡܡܘܠܐ܀
ܬ̈ܠܝܠܐ ܚܕܪܘ ܥܠ ܩܠܐ:
370 ܘܐܫܬܠܝ ܦܘܠܚܢ ܩܒܘܬܐ.
ܘܫܘܒܚܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܢ ܒܐܠܝܢ:
ܠܐ ܙܟܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܡܘܠܐ܀
ܫܒܩ ܗܘܘ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܕ ܒܐܠܝܢ:
ܐܚܕ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܢܦܩܬܐ.
375 ܘܟܠ ܬܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܛܪܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܚܣܝܪܐ ܠܚܣܝܢܐ܀

---

347. ܢܘܚ] ܕܢܘܚ D — 354. ܡܢ] in marg. — 357. ܘܒܢ̈ܫܘܗܝ] ABCDEI, read(?) ܘܢܫܝܗܘܢ — 367. om. 2(?) stiches ABCDEI — 371. ܕܐܢ ܒܐܠܝܢ] corr. in marg. from ܕܒܐܠܝܢ

ܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܟܢܪ ܡܪ̈ܝܢܐ:
ܠܓܢ̈ܣܐ ܕܟܢܫܝܢ ܠܬܪܥ ܢܘܚ.
ܠܐ ܪܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܟܠ ܡܒܢܐ:
380 ܫܒܩܘ ܚܘܪܒܐ ܘܪܚܡܘ ܫܝܢܐ܀
ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܟܙܢ ܒܙܘܓܐ:
ܬܡܟܘܬܐ ܒܐܕܢ̈ܝ ܬ̈ܓܠܠܐ.
ܒܬܘܡ ܡܫܟܢܐ ܕܩܒܘܬܐ:
ܘܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܚܘܒܬ ܒܪܐ܀
385 ܒܡܐܐ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܘ.
ܘܒܕܡܘܬ ܫܒܝܠܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܘܬܐ:
ܡܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܡܡܘܠܐ܀
ܘܡܕܒܪܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܢܘܚ̈ܝ:
390 ܬ̇ܚܕܗ ܠܦܘܣܩ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܕܡܒܐ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܢܘ̈ܚܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܪܓܙ ܠܟܐ ܕܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ܀
ܓܠ ܢܘܚ ܘܐܟܠ ܚܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܦܩܕܗ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ.
395 ܘܐܚܕܗ̇ ܙܡܪܐ ܩܒܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܟܠܗ̇ ܚܝܠܗ ܕܒܪܘܝܐ܀
ܟܠܗ ܚܫܟܐ ܘܦܫܘ ܬ̈ܠܠܐ:
ܕܗܘܘ ܚܫܟܐ ܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ.
ܘܐܟܣܬ ܐܝܠܢ ܒܐܘܬܐ:
400 ܒܫܬܩܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ܀
ܘܒܬܪ ܫܒܥܐ ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ:
ܒܫܢܬ ܫܬܡܐܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܢܘܚ.
ܒܝܪܚܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܐܪܒܥ ܒܗ̇:
ܥܠ ܒܐܘܬܐ ܒܡܕܪܬܐ܀
405 ܘܡܥܡܩܬܐ ܒܡܒܘܥܐ:
ܢܦܩ ܓܘܢܚܐ ܕܒܪ ܕܝܢܐ.
ܘܥܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܬܓ̈ܢܐ ܢܦܩܬ:
ܐܦܦܣܘ ܕܬܟܒܬܐ܀

---

392. ܪܓܙ] in marg. in 2nd hand(?) — 407. ܟܠܗܘܢ] repeated (dit.) E

ܘܐܬܬܪܥܘ ܢܒ̈ܥܐ ܕܬܗܘܡܐ:
410 ܘܫܡ̈ܝܐ ܕܪܘܡܐ ܐܬܦܬܚܘ.
ܘܟܘܦܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܣܪܒܗ̇:
ܪܡܙܐ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܡܬܒܥܬܐ܀
ܫܠܡܘ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܕܒܡܘܡܐ ܠܪܘܡܐ:
ܘܢܚܬܘ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܥ̈ܠܝܐ.
415 ܘܒܗܝܢ ܡܕܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܦܟܪܬ:
ܒܐܘܬܐ ܠܒܘܠܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ܀
ܬܗܘܡܐ ܒܣܒܪܗ ܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܫܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܫܡ̈ܝܐ ܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܘܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܡ̈ܝܐ ܩܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
420 ܕܢܦܩܘ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܕܡܪ̈ܚܝܐ܀
ܫܒܩܐ ܗܘܐ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܣܪܝܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܠܠܐ ܟܕ ܫܠܡ.
ܘܥܠ ܚܠܠܘܗ̄ܝ ܡܒܥ ܗܘܐ:
ܠܬ̈ܠܠܐ ܕܫܡܠܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ܀
425 ܡܒܥܐ ܕܠܥܠ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ:
ܥܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܥܠ ܡܫܬܗ.
ܕܐܫܬܗ ܒܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܪܘܡܐ:
ܠܐܪܥܐ ܘܕܠܫܗ̇ ܠܥܦܘܬܗ܀
ܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܡ̈ܝܐ:
430 ܟܕ ܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܡܐ.
ܘܦܓܥܝܢ ܕܠܥܠ ܥܡ ܕܠܬܚܬ:
ܐܝܟ ܐܚܐ ܠܐܚ̈ܐ ܕܒܥܘܬܐ܀
ܥܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܡܪܗܘܢ ܗܘܐ:
ܠܥ̈ܠܝܐ ܠܡܚܬ ܠܐܪܥܐ.
435 ܘܪܡܙܐ ܕܣܒܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܠܬ̈ܚܬܝܐ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܡܐ܀
ܡܫܬܐ ܘܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܥܬܝ̈ܩܐ:
ܡܦܠܓ ܠܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܬ̈ܠܠܐ.
ܕܟܕ ܣܪܚܝܢ ܬܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ:
440 ܘܫܠܡܘ ܘܢܚܬܘ ܠܡܬܒܥܬܐ܀

---

409. ܕܬܗܘܡܐ] add. sey. BCDE — 418. ܠܫܡ̈ܝܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) — 428. before corr. stich foll. by stich 427 (dit.)

ܐܪܥܐ [ܒܡܝܐ] ܡܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܘܛܘܪ̈ܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܫܬ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܘܐܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܪ̈ܘܡܐ ܘܥܘܡ̈ܩܐ:
* f. 95r [ܠܡܒܘܬܐ] * ܫܘܝܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܒܘܥ̈ܝܢ܀
445 ܘܡܬܛܪܦܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܠܚ̈ܐ:
ܟܕ ܥܠܝܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܣܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܘܡܬܬܥܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ:
ܘܠܝܬ ܕܡܥܕܪ ܠܐܠܝ̈ܐ܀
ܫܠܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܡܐ:
450 ܘܡܚܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܒܘܠܐ.
ܘܢܚܬܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܥܘܡܩܐ:
ܘܫܒܩܐ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܠܡܘܒܠܗܘܢ܀
ܡܟܐ ܘܡܟܐ ܢܒܙ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܡܪܒܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܬ̈ܠܠܐ.
455 ܘܠܐ ܦܨ ܫܪܝܕܐ ܟܕ ܥܒܪ:
ܒܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ܀
ܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܥܕܢ ܠܠܝ ܐܝܡܡ:
ܡܛܪܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܢܚܬ ܗܘܐ.
ܘܬܗܘܡܐ ܠܥܠ ܫܠܡ ܗܘܐ:
460 ܟܕ ܚܙܝܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܡ̈ܝܐ܀
ܒܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܘܡܐ̈ܬܐ ܚܕ ܕܗܘ:
ܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܐܥܒܪ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ.
ܘܟܘܦܐ ܡܥܢܐ ܦܩܘܕܘܗ̄ܝ:
ܠܡܕܠܐ ܡܥܢܐ ܕܒܘܠܐ܀
465 ܒܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܘܡܐ̈ܬܐ ܡܦܩܗ̇:
ܪܡܙܐ ܠܒܪܡܐ ܣܪܘܒܐ.
ܘܡ̈ܝܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܚܕ ܘܪ̈ܐ:
ܕܟܘ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܚܛ̈ܝܬܐ܀
ܬܗܘܡܐ ܒܚܫܘܡܗ ܡܕܪ ܗܘܐ:
470 ܚܝܠܗ ܪܒܐ ܕܒܘܪܝܐ.
ܕܪܡܙܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܚܝܕܗ:
ܘܐܟܡ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܬ̈ܠܠܐ܀

---

441. [ܐܪܥܐ ܒܡܝܐ]] illegible in A, read as BCDEI | ܡܠܝܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) — 444. [ܠܡܒܘܬܐ]] illegible in A, read as BCDEI — 465. ܡܦܩܗ̇] read ܡܦܩܗ as C

ܥܫܢܘ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܐܬܟܣܝܘ ܛܘ̈ܪܐ ܪ̈ܡܐ.
ܘܣܦܬ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܘܒܥܝܪܐ:
ܘܦܪܚܬܐ ܕܓܦܐ ܘܐܝ̈ܠܢܐ❖
ܫܩܠܘ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܠܥܠ ܡܗܠ̈ܟܝܢ:
ܕܥܠܝܡܘܬܐ ܘܣܝܒܘܬܐ.
ܕܥܩܡ ܗܘܘ ܣܡܟܪ̈ܢܝܗܘܢ:
ܐܒܥܘ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ❖
ܚܕ ܡܚܘܐ ܚܪܒ ܘܡܚܒܪ:
ܡܚܒܠܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ.
ܘܚܛܝܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܥܫܢܘ:
ܠܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܠܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ❖
ܢܘܚ ܘܕܒܝܬܗ ܐܬܦܨܝܘ:
ܡܢ ܥܠ ܕܢܚܬܐ ܒܐܦ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܙܒܢܐ ܦܠܛ ܗܘܐ ܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܥܬܝ̈ܩܐ❖
ܛܒܥܗ̇ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܠܡܟܣܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܣܩܗ̇ ܠܪܘܡܐ ܟܕ ܚܠܠ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܘܡܬܛܠܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܥܠ ܡ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܐܚܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ❖
ܥܒܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܥܠ ܪ̈ܡܬܐ:
ܠܥܠ ܡܢ ܪܘܡܐ ܕܫܘܦ̈ܢܐ.
ܘܢܦܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ̇ ܡܫܥ̈ܠܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܬܙܝܥ ܗܘܐ ܪܟܒܗ̇❖
ܟܬܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܓ̈ܠܠܐ ܬܫܘܬܗ̇:
ܘܟܪܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܢܣܐܝܬ.
ܡܟܒܟܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܟܐ ܘܠܟܐ:
ܡܫܟܢܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܟܐܢܐ❖
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܛܟܣܐ ܥܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܡ̈ܝܐ ܘܐܐܪ ܠܣܕ̈ܪܐ.
ܘܡܬܬܥܝܩܘܢ ܡܚܘܬܐ:
ܒܫܝܢܐ ܘܢܝܚܐ ܫܪܝܐ ܗܘܬ❖

---

483. ܥܫܢܘ] read ܥܫܢ as BCDE

ܛܥܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܬܗܘܡܐ ܘܣܒܠ:
ܘܡܦܝܣ ܠܗ̇ ܥܠ ܟܬܦܗ.
ܘܡܣܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܓ̈ܠܠܐ ܩܕܡܝܗ̇:
ܘܡܗܟܝܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܪܕܝܬܗ̇❖
ܐܘ ܐܠܦܐ ܕܕܠܐ ܠܩ̈ܐ:
ܕܥܒܪܬܗ ܠܢܘܚܐ ܘܢܫܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܕܒܪܗ̇ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ:
ܒܫܓܘܫܬܐ ܕܡܫܥ̈ܠܐ❖
ܐܘ ܣܦܝܢܬܐ ܕܛܥܝܢܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܥܠܡܐ ܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܣܟܗ.
ܘܠܐ ܐܫܬܘܫܬ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܗ̇:
ܕܢܕܒܪܘܢܗ̇ ܡܠ̈ܚܐ❖
ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܡܠܚܢܐ:
ܘܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ.
ܘܕܘܒܪ ܥܡܥܡܐ ܓ ܚܢܢܐ:
ܡܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܠܡܐܢܐ❖
ܟܐܘܡܢܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ:
ܐܫܘܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܕܒܪܢܝܬܗ̇.
ܘܥܪܩܐ ܗܘܬ [ܒܗ̇] ܠܛܒܥܘܬܐ:
ܫܠܦ ܙܘܥܐ ܕܟܬܪ̈ܢܐ❖
ܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ ܒܫܒܥܐ:
ܪܕܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܟ [ܕܒܢܘܗܪܐ].
ܕܟܠܝܐ ܕܩܐܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ̇:
ܠܐ ܚܫܟ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܢܗܝܪܐ❖
ܠܫܘܠܡ ܐܪܒܥܝܢ [ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ]:
ܫܟܠܬ ܣܦܗ̇ ܟܐܢܘܬܐ.
ܘܠܟܐܐ ܘܫܟܝܢ ܐܬܬܢܝܚܬ:
ܐܬܐ ܕܙܒܢܐ * ܒܪܫ ܛܘܪܐ❖ * f. 95v
ܒܬܪ ܡܟܐܐ ܘܫܟܝܢ ܡ̈ܝܐ:
ܢܩܡ ܙܒܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܢ ܓܕܐ.
ܘܛܥܝܢ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܫܢܝܐ:
ܕܥܬܒܘܗܝ ܙܒܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܪܘ ܓܒܐ❖

---

509. ܠܩ̈ܐ] ܠܢܩ̈ܐ BCDE -- 520. ܠܗ̇] above line B -- 522. ܡܕܒܪܢܝܬܗ̇] corr. from ܡܕܒܪܢܝܬܐ -- 523. [ܒܗ̇]] illegible in A, read as BCDEI — 526. [ܕܒܢܘܗܪܐ]] partially illegible in A, read as BCDEI — 527. ܕܩܐܡ] corr. from ܩܐܡ A(in 2nd hand) C — 529. [ܝܘ̈ܡܬܐ]] illegible in A, read as BCDEI — 536. ܕܥܬܒܘܗܝ] read ܕܥܬܒܘܗ̇ as BCDE

ܚܣ ܡܪ̈ܐ ܠܥܡܐ ܘܣܚܡܝܟ:
ܘܐܬܢܣܘ ܕܪ̈ܓܠܐ.
ܘܟܠܐ ܙܡܪܐ ܒܥܬܩ̈ܐ:
ܘܟܒܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܬܗܘܡܐ܀ 540
ܠܥܡܐ ܘܣܚܡܝܟ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܒܪܬܗ ܠܡܝܐ ܡܒܘܬܐ.
ܘܬܪܥܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ:
ܠܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܘܡܢ ܒܬ ܐܪܥܐ܀
ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܪܒܝ ܠܒܢ: 545
ܫܘܬ ܒܥܒܪܝ ܡܪܕܝܬܗ.
ܘܫܒܩܬܗ ܠܗܘܦܟܐ ܕܐܘܪܚܗ:
ܥܠ ܙܟܪܐ ܕܦܠܘܪ، ܦܘܕܪܘ܀
ܒܥܠܟ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܚܕܪ ܗܘܐ:
ܐܦ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܪܘܚܒܗ. 550
ܕܬܒܥܢ ܚܛܗܐ ܕܢܫܬ ܐܕܡ:
ܕܢܥܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܒܬ ܐܪܥܐ܀
ܠܗܠ ܡܢ ܡܝܐ ܒܚܪ ܗܘܐ:
ܗܘ ܕܙܪܐ ܕܢܦܠ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܘܒܕܒܠ ܠܐ ܚܝܐ ܗܘܬ: 555
ܡܢ ܒܬ ܐܪܥܐ ܠܡܫܘ̈ܬܐ܀
ܫܦܟ ܗܘܐ ܡܝܐ ܒܐܦܝ̈ܗܘܢ:
ܒܕܡܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܦܘܩܢܐ.
ܘܬܪܥܗ ܙܡܪܐ ܠܫܝܠܗ:
ܘܐܒܕܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܢ ܒܬܐ܀ 560
ܒܥܒܒܘܬܐ ܕܦܪܕܝܣܐ:
ܒܚܪܝܟ ܗܘܘ ܒܫܪܐ ܕܪ̈ܡ.
ܘܐܪܥܐ ܟܠܗ ܦܣܘܩܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܡܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܚܝܘ̈ܬܐ܀
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܝܕܢܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܘܬ: 565
ܡܢ ܡܝܐ ܕܒܢܐ ܠܡܝܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܛܠܠ ܒܗ ܩܠ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܕܫܗ ܪܓܠ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ܀

---

543. ܡܪܕܝܬܐ] read ܡܪܕܝܬܗ as BCDE — 552. ܕܢܥܫܘܢ] ܕܢܚܫܘܢ BCDE — 565. ܕܝܕܢܬܐ] om. in. ܕ BCDE

ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ، ܬܫܡܫܬܗ:
ܐܦ ܦܠܚܘܬܐ ܠܡܒܘܬܐ. 570
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܒܢܪܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܕܡ:
ܘܬܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܗܘܫܬܐ܀
ܥܠܬ ܦܓܘܪܐ ܕܪܘܫܗ:
ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܪ ܒܗ ܒܪܫ.
ܟܕ ܫܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܥܒܕܬܗ: 575
ܕܒܥܘܕܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܢܫܡܘܪ܀
ܠܘ ܡܢ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܦܪܕ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܥܡܪ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ.
ܠܘ ܒܬܘܬܐ ܥܒܪܐ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬ ܡܠܒܬܐ܀ 580
ܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܢܪܗܢ ܒܬܪܐ:
ܒܥܒܕܬܗ ܩܕܡ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܘܐܦܩܗ ܠܓܠܝܐ ܒܛܠ̈ܠܬܐ:
ܠܕܘܪܫܐ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܐ܀
ܐܦ ܬܘܒ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܢܦܠ ܗܘܐ: 585
ܘܓܠܐ ܒܚܝܐ ܠܬܘܩܢ̈ܗ،
ܠܘ ܪܘܓܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܡܢ ܥܠ:
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܦܣ ܟܐܢܐ ܕܥܒܪ܀
ܢܟܒ ܗܘܐ ܩܕܡ ܦܘܩܢܐ:
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘ̈ܝ، ܘܥܬܝ̈ܕܢ. 590
ܘܡܦܣ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܒܬܘܩܢܗ:
ܕܒܐܟܠ ܡܒܘܬܐ ܘܨܪܐ ܠܗ܀
ܒܗܠܐ ܢܟܠܗ ܠܬܘܩܢܗ:
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܦܠܚܐ ܠܥܒܕܬܗ.
ܕܒܠܐ ܢܒܪܐ ܠܫܠܝܐ: 595
ܢܟܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܫܠܐ ܫܠܝܟ܀
ܡܦܣ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܥܪܒܐ:
ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܕܟܠ ܒܥܝܪ̈ܟ.
ܘܟܠ ܗܕܐ ܦܠܚ ܘܐܟܠ:
ܠܡܒܘܬܐ ܘܪ̈ ܟܝܟ ܘܪ̈ ܟܝܟ܀ 600

---

590. ܘܥܬܝ̈ܕܢ] ܘܕܥܬܝ̈ܕܢ BCDE — 592. ܕܒܐܟܠ] ܐ above line

ܪܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܡܢ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܕܟܠ ܕܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܬܘܗܝܗ:
ܢܚܠܗ ܘܓܒܪ ܠܐܣܝܢܐ܀
ܒܬܪܒܝܬܐ ܕܙܪ̈ܥܝ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܕܡ ܕܢܚܠ.
ܘܩܕܡ ܦܩܕܗ ܠܡܒܘܠܐ:
ܕܢܕ̈ܢܐ ܕܚܫܘܒ̈ܝܗܘܢ܀
ܡܢ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ:
ܓܒܗ ܫܪܒܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܢܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܒܒܪ ܐܬܩ̈ܢܗ܀
ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܦ̈ܘܗܝ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܐܬܘܢ ܠܗܘܝܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܒܬܘܬܐ ܢܦܠ ܒܠ:
ܘܡܛܠ ܪ̈ܚܡܘܗܝ ܒܗ ܘܫܒܩ܀
ܘܦܘܗܝ ܚܙܘ ܘܐܒܘܬܗ:
ܕܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܠܟܠ ܒܣܒܪ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܘܦܘܗܝ ܕܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܕܪ̈ܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܦܠܘܢ * ܕܪܫܡ ܒܡܠܐ ܗܘ܀
ܘܫܠܛ ܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܒܐܒܘܬܗ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܦܪܘܫܘܗܝ ܚܘܒܐ. […]
ܒܬ̈ܘܬܗܘܢ ܦܘܗܝ ܚܝܠܗ:
ܒܗ ܕܙܪܥܐ ܘܒܗ ܕܫܒܩ.
ܘܐܒܪܐ ܫܘܠܛܢ ܡܪ̈ܘܬܗ:
ܕܝܢ ܒܢܝܗ ܙܪܥܐ ܠܕܝܠܗ܀
ܒܫܘܩ̈ܐ ܕܡ̈ܢܐ ܕ̈ܓܒܝܐ:
ܢܓܕܗ ܠܡܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܚܝܢܐ.
ܘܡܫܒܠܐ ܕܦܩܫ ܒܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܒܗ ܢܛܪ ܓܒܫܐ ܠܫ̈ܢܐ܀
ܓܒܝܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܚܝܐ ܠܫܪܒܢܐ:
ܕܦܠܛܘ ܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܡܢ ܪܘܓܙܐ.

* f. 96r

---

615. ܒܠ] corr. in marg. from ܗܘܐ D -- 619. ܕܐܒܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) | ܗܘ] corr. from ܗܘܐ — 622. om. 2(?) stiches ABCDEI

ܘܐܟܒܪ ܫܒܩܘܗܝ ܒܡܢ ܒܬܐ:
ܕܢܦܪܐ ܙܪܥܗ ܠܟܠ ܦܢܝ̈ܢ܀
ܒܢܝܢܐ ܫܒܝܚܐ ܒܠܬ:
ܐܠܦܐ ܘܐܬܬ ܠܠܡܐܢܐ.
ܘܫܒܫܒ̈ܪܐ ܒܡܫܢܝܐ:
ܢܣܬ ܒܠ ܛܘܦ̈ܝ ܘܩܪܒܘ܀
ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܣܘܟܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܒܫܒܫܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܗ.
ܘܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܫܒܒܐ ܒܠܬ:
ܠܠܡܐܢܐ ܒܫܒܫܒܪܐ܀
ܡ̈ܢܝܐ ܫܒܒܐ ܒܠܡܐܢܐ:
ܐܣܝܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܘܢܛܝܪܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܦܬܚܬ ܒܒܐ ܕܒܘܬܪܗ:
ܒܕܡܐ ܠܒܢܝܢܐ ܬܪܝܢܐ܀
ܒܢܝܢܐ ܬܪܝܢܐ ܫܕܪ:
ܡܪܐ ܐܠܦܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܕܐ.
ܕܢܦܘܩ ܢܘܚܐ ܐܢ ܢܣܬ:
ܚܒܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ܀
ܒܘܪܟܐ ܓܒܐ ܐܫܬܕܪ:
ܝܘܢܐ ܘܢܫܩ ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ.
ܘܫܒܬܗ ܪܓܬ ܒܣܪܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܓܠܦ ܦܢ ܦܬ ܓܒܝܐ܀
ܫܕܪ ܐܝܟ ܓܒܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ:
ܡܢ ܓܒܝܐ ܪܫܡ ܫܒܝܐ.
ܘܢܦܩܬ ܝܘܢܐ ܘܫܒܪܬܗ:
ܠܡܫܪܝܬܐ ܘܓܠܦܬ ܒܐܕ̈ܘܗܝ܀
ܘܦܩ ܬܘܒ ܫܒܒܐ ܡܫܬ̈ܠܬܐ:
ܘܗܦܟ ܫܕܪ ܐܝܟ ܓܒܐ.
ܘܐܬܬ ܝܘܢܐ ܘܓܒܝܢܐ:
ܫܪܝܬܐ ܕܫܒܝܢܐ ܒܓܘ ܦܘܡܗ܀
ܛܪܦܗ ܕܙܝܬܐ ܫܘܬܦܗ:
ܕܫܕܪ ܠܗ ܢܘܚܐ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ.

---

636. ܘܐܬܬ] corr. in marg. in 2nd hand(?) from ܠܐܬܝܐ — 638. ܘܩܪܒܘ] add. sey. BD — 662. ܕܫܒܝܢܐ] ܕܫܒܝܢܗ BCD — 663. ܛܪܦܗ] ܛܪܦܐ BCDE

665 ܐܝܟ ܪܘܚܡܐ ܕܬܪܒܘܬܐ:
ܕܢܣܒܬ ܫܒܬܗ ܕܕܢܝܐ ✣
ܒܢܝ̈ ܐܬܒܥܐ ܕܪܡܫܐ:
ܒܐ ܦܪܬܐ ܕܥܒܝܐ ܕܐܬܝܬ.
ܘܗܦܟ ܥܕܪܗ ܠܟܝܢ ܦܪܕܐ:
670 ܕܒܙܐ ܕܥܕܪ ܥܡܘܕܗ ✣
ܬܠܬ ܙܒܢܝ̈ܢ ܢܦܩܬ ܡܢܗ:
ܘܥܕܪܬܗ ܒܬܠܬܝܗܝܢ.
ܘܦܬܚ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܩܒܘܬܐ:
ܘܒܙܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܘܐܬܒܥܐ ✣
675 ܒܙܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܒܫܒܚ ܡܠܐ:
ܥܕ ܓܠ̈ܠܐ ܙܘܥܐ.
ܕܗܐ ܗܘܘ ܙܘܥܐ ܡܢ ܟ̈ܐܦܐ:
ܘܡܫܘܗ̇ ܠܫܒܬܗ ܕܕܢܝܐ ✣
ܗܐ ܐܦܫܬܗ ܠܒܥܘܬܐ:
680 ܕܢܦܩܬ ܬܪܥܐ ܒܐܦܝ̈ܟܘܢ.
ܦܘܡ ܐܦܪ̈ܐ ܘܐܬܒܥܐܘ:
ܒܝܬܐ ܦܐܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ✣
ܒܬܪ ܥܬܒܐܐ ܠܢܪ̈ܝܩܝ:
ܒܥܠܡ ܥܒܬܐ ܕܒܬܪܗܘܢ.
685 ܦܩܕ ܠܗ ܪܒܐ ܠܕܘܡܐ:
ܕܢܦܘܩ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܗܘ ܕܟܠܗ ✣
ܦܘܩ ܐܢܬ ܘܒܢܝ̈ܟ ܠܟ ܥܡܟ:
ܘܐܢܬܬܟ ܥܡ ܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܒܢܝ̈ܟ.
ܘܐܦܩ ܥܡܟ ܦܪ̈ܚܬܐ:
690 ܘܒܥܝܪܐ ܘܪܚܫܐ ܥܡܟ ✣
ܦܬܠ ܟܐܒܐ ܦܘܪܢܐ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܘܐܦܩ ܟܠ ܒܢ̈ܝܢ.
ܘܠܐ ܦܓܥ ܚܪܒܗܘܢ ܕܣܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ ✣
695 ܐܝܟ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ:
ܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܬܡܢ ܒܪ ܥܠܡܝܢ.

---

665. ܕܬܪܒܘܬܐ] corr. from ܕܬܪܒܝܬܐ — 674. ܠܐܪܥܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) — 680. ܒܐܦܝ̈ܟܘܢ] ܒܐܦܝ̈ܗܘܢ BCDE — 684. ܕܒܬܪܗܘܢ] corr. from ܕܒܬܪܗܘܢ BD — 692. ܟܠ] add. in. ܠ D

ܕܪܒܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܢܛܪ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܡܚܝܣ ܗܘܐ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ ✣
ܢܦܩܘ ܐܦܪ̈ܐ ܒܪ ܚܝܝ:
700 ܡܛܠ ܕܚܝܣ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ. […]
ܒܢܝܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܦܘܪܢܐ ܥܒܬ ܐܦܪ̈ܐ.
ܘܒܢܝܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܦܬܚܗ:
ܠܬܪܥܐ ܕܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܒܐܦܝ̈ܗܘܢ ✣
705 ܒܥܒܕ̈ܐ ܒܒܝܫܐ:
ܡܪܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܐܘܬܐ.
ܘܒܥܒܕܐ ܘܒܚܫܝܢ ܒܐܝܪ:
ܢܣܒܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܒܥܘܬܐ ✣
* ܒܐܝܪ ܓܒܪܗ ܠܛܘܦܢܐ:
710 ܒܐܫܬܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ.
ܕܕܠܒܐ ܢܝܘܢ ܡܪ̈ܝܐ:
ܕܗܦܟܘܬ ܡܦܠܐ ܠܒܕܬ ✣
ܒܐܝܪ ܓܒܪܗ ܠܡܦܩܬܐ:
ܒܢܝܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܘܡܢ ܒܗ.
715 ܕܒܫܝܬܐ ܕܕ̈ܪܒܐ ܘܦܐܪ̈ܐ:
ܢܫܪܐ ܠܒܐ ܕܡܒܩ̈ܐ ✣
ܐܝܟ ܒܘܡܒܐ ܕܒܘܬܪܐ ܪܒܐ:
ܕܫܒܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܠܐ.
ܕܡܛܠ ܠܗ ܬܘܩܢܗ:
720 ܘܒܢܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܢܝܚܗ ✣
ܒܢܝܫܝ ܬܘܡ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܒܬܪܗ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܒܐܝ̈ܠܢܐ.
ܘܐܥܒܕܘ ܐܒ̈ܢܐ ܘܫܬ̈ܩܬܐ:
ܠܚܘܒܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܘܡܢ ܒܗ ✣
725 ܒܐܝܪ ܦܬܚܗ ܠܡܒܘܬܐ:
ܒܢܝܐ ܕܐܚܕܗ ܒܐܦܝ̈ܗܘܢ.
ܘܛܠܒ ܦܬܘܪ ܬܘܪܣܝܐ:
ܘܒܢܐ ܦܐܐ ܡܕܒܚܗܘܢ ✣

* f. 96v

---

700. om. 2(?) stiches ABCDEI — 714. ܕܦܐܐ] corr. from ܕܬܪܝܢ B (cf. 701) — 715. ܕܕ̈ܪܒܐ] om. sey. BCE — 719. ܬܘܩܢܗ] ܠܬܘܩܢܗ B(corr. from ܬܘܩܢܗ) D

ܒܢܝܫܢ ܐܦܣܗ̇ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ:
ܠܚܘܫܒܬܐ ܕܒܥܬ ܡܫܪܟ.
ܘܒܥ ܠܗ̇ ܓܒܘܠܐ ܒܕܒܪܐ:
ܘܓܒܠ ܠܗ̇ ܟܠܝܠ ܗܕܡ̈ܐ܀
ܒܢܝܫܢ ܬܘܒ ܢܚܬ ܐܚܝܢ:
ܠܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܟܕ ܪܥܝܬܢ.
ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܬܡܢ ܐܚܝܢ:
ܢܚܬ ܣܘܟܠ ܬܘܩܢܗ܀
ܒܒܢܝܐ ܦܢ ܣܢܐ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܢܘܚ:
ܥܡܠ ܘܓܒܪ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܗ.
ܘܐܦܩܗ ܒܢܝܚܐ ܕܗܕܡ̈ܐ:
ܘܚܝ̈ ܥܡܗ ܠܟܠ ܡܕܡ܀
ܢܦܩܘ ܗܘܘ ܟܠ ܓܢ̈ܣܝܢ ܥܡ ܢܘܚ:
ܘܪܒܘ ܥܡܗ ܟܠ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܘܦܪܚ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܪܥܝܬܐ:
ܠܢܗܪܐ ܕܒܛܠ ܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ܀
ܓܒܠܐ ܢܘܚ ܡܕܒܚ ܡܢ ܒܥܝܪܐ:
ܘܐܣܩ ܕܒܚ̈ܐ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ.
ܘܩܒܠ ܕܒܚܗ ܒܪܘܚܐ:
ܥܡ ܛܘܒܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܢܝܗ܀
ܐܪܝܚ ܪܝܚܐ ܕܒܣܡܬܐ:
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܣܝܪ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܘܐܬܬܢܝܚ ܡܢ ܚܡܬܐ ܕܪܘܓܙܗ:
ܒܢܝܐ ܕܡܬܟܬܫ ܠܐ ܪܓܙ܀
ܠܐ ܠܡ ܐܘܣܦ ܠܡܠܛܗ̇:
ܠܐܪܥܐ ܡܛܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܕܝܨܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܝܫ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܪܫ:
ܥܠ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܛܠܝܘܬܗ܀
ܘܡܚܝܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܘܫ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܪܓܐ ܚܕܐ ܘܡܠܠܬܐ.
ܡܠܟܐ ܘܡܫܘܬܐ ܟܕ ܪܕܝ:
ܒܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܫܘ̈ܠܦܝܗܘܢ܀

---

740. ܠܟܠ ܡܕܡ] om. in. ܠ E — 743. ܘܦܪܚ] ܘܦܪܚܘ D — 758. ܚܕܐ] add. in. ܘ D — 759. ܡܠܟܐ] add in. ܘ D

ܦܪܚܗ ܠܐܪܒܥܐ ܒܫܘ̈ܠܦܐ:
ܟܕ ܡܗܒܐ ܦܐܪܐ ܠܐܝܠܢ̈ܐ.
ܘܠܐܝܠܢ̈ܐ ܦܪܥ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܒܛܠܠܐ ܘܡܠܕܐ ܕܡܘܒܠܐ܀
ܕܢܬܒܥܘܢ ܐܪܥܐ ܟܠ ܟܠ:
ܟܠ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܒܥܝܪܐ.
ܘܒܥܝܪܐ ܕܫܘܠܛܢ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ:
ܐܒܕܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܓܢ̈ܣܐ܀
ܘܥܡ ܒܥܝ̈ܪܬܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ:
ܘܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܥܠ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܥܒܕܐ:
ܢܐܟܠܘܢ ܒܣܪܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ܀
ܗܘ̇ ܐܢܘܢ ܦܘܪܥܢܐ:
ܕܐܝܟ ܢܟܣܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܕܡܐ ܕܐܫܕܘ ܕܡܗܘܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ:
ܢܐܟܠܘܢ ܗܝܕܝܢ ܦܓܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ܀
ܕܡܐ ܠܡ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܠܐ ܬܐܟܘܠ:
ܕܕܡܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܣܪܐ.
ܠܐ ܬܐܟܘܠ ܒܣܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܬܬܚܝܒ ܒܬܒܥܬܐ܀
ܠܐ ܢܕܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܕܒܚ̈ܐ:
ܠܡܐܟܠ ܒܣܪܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܒܕܡܐ ܕܓܠܐ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ:
ܠܢܘܚ ܕܐܟܘܠ ܘܐܡܪ ܐܓܠ܀
ܢܬܚܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܘܗܕܢܐ:
ܕܣܐܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܟܝܢܐ.
ܘܐܦ ܢܕܒܚܘܗܝ ܡܕܒܚ̈ܐ:
ܢܘܚ ܡܛܠ ܢܓܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ܀
ܒܗܕܐ ܕܣܡ ܠܗ ܢܬܚܘܐ:
ܗܘ̇ ܕܚܕܬܐ ܗܘ ܢܬܚܘܐ.
ܘܐܦ ܣܝܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܕܒܚ̈ܐ:
ܠܐ ܡܚܕܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܣܒܗ܀

---

771. ܐܝܟ] add. in. ܕ B(above line) D

ܒܟܠܬ ܡܠܠܐ ܕܢܘܚܬܐ:
ܙܗܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܡܠܠܐ.
ܕܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܠܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܚܠܦ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܒܗ ܬܐܒܝܢ܀
ܡܠܟܐ ܗܘ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܪܘܗܝ:
ܘܡܪܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ.
* f. 97r
*ܘܠܦܘܬ ܪܒܘܬ ܐܝܩܪܗ:
ܡܫܚܐ ܬܫܒܚܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܗ܀
ܢܒܩܐ ܚܪ̈ܬܐ ܫܡ ܠܗ:
ܙܟܐ ܠܡܢܪܐ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܗ.
ܘܓܒܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܥܠ ܠܒܗ:
ܒܦܣܩܐ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܕܡܢ ܚܝܘܗ܀
ܟܠ ܬܘܒ ܚܟܡܗ ܒܡܫܚܐ:
ܘܙܪ̈ܥܗ ܠܚܢܐ ܒܡܫ̈ܘܚܬܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܐܚܠܦܐ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܡ̈ܫܚܐ ܕܦܠܘܚܐ܀
ܗܕܐ ܗܝ ܐܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܐ:
ܕܡܫܡܫ ܐܢܐ ܒܗ ܠܐܪܥܐ.
ܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ:
ܡܢ ܒܬ ܡ̈ܝܐ ܕܥܢ̈ܢܐ܀
ܐܬܚܙܝܗ ܗܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܐܬܐ:
ܥܡ ܬܘܡܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܘܠܐ ܡܟܐ ܢܘܢܗ ܠܡܪ̈ܝܐ:
ܒܥܒܕܐ ܕܓܠܗ̇ ܒܡܥܒ̈ܕܘܗܝ܀
ܠܢܘܚ ܡܚܘܝܗ̇ ܒܐܬܐ ܕܫܝܢܐ:
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܒܥܒܕܐ ܠܥܘܠܡܐ.
ܕܥܒܐ ܕܣܡ ܠܗ̇ ܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ:
ܢܬܒܥܐܘܢ ܒܐܬܐ ܕܫܝܢܐ܀
ܫܒܩ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܫܐ:
ܒܢܒܩܐ ܚܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܓܒܠ.
ܘܐܡܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܡܫܚܐ:
ܠܡܦܠܓ ܐܪܒܥܐ ܒܢܬܬ܀

ܫܪܝ ܠܡ ܢܘܚ ܒܒܢܝܢܐ:
ܘܢܨܒ ܟܪܡܐ ܘܝܗܒ ܦܐܪ̈ܐ.
ܘܐܫܬܝ ܡܢ ܚܡܪܗ ܘܪܘܝ:
ܘܦܠܚܐ ܗܘ ܒܫܪܝܘܬ ܥܠܡܗ܀
ܠܐ ܥܡܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܢܫܝܗ:
ܕܟܦܗܐ ܥܡܫܗ ܠܒܢܝܢܐ.
ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ:
ܡܬܚܫܚ ܒܗ ܥܬܘܩܘ̈ܗܝ܀
ܐܫܬܝ ܢܘܚ ܘܦܠܚܐ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܘܐܘܒܠܗ ܚܡܪܐ ܠܫܢܬܐ.
ܘܐܗܠܬ ܒܗ ܡܪܘܝܘܬܐ:
ܡܢ ܚܝܠܗ ܕܚܕ ܐܠܦܐ܀
ܒܠܗ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܡܪܢܐ:
ܥܠ ܕܐܗܠ ܒܗ ܕܠܐ ܒܚܘܫ.
ܘܒܕܢܗ ܚܝܪܐ ܕܒܕܘܬܐ:
ܕܢܓܠ ܒܗ ܠܐܚ̈ܝܐ܀
ܒܠܓܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܡ. ܡܪ̈ܘܝܐ:
ܐܫܪܝ ܡܠܟܐ ܒܡܫ̈ܟܢܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܚܡ ܠܡܠܟܐ:
ܘܢܗܘܘܢ ܠܡܠ̈ܟܐ ܒܥܒܕܘܬܗ܀
ܠܗ ܒܡܫܚܐ ܐܫܪܬܗ:
ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܡܠܬ ܟܐܢܐ.
ܠܝܬ ܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܚܝܒܘܬ ܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ܀
ܡܢ ܚܝܠܗ ܕܚܛ ܒܗ:
ܒܡܦܩܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܒܫܪܪܗ.
ܘܥܒܕܗ ܐܬܐ ܠܡܪ̈ܘܝܐ:
ܕܢܬܟܪܘܢ ܡܢ ܚܡܪ̈ܐ܀
ܪܫܡ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܬܫܥܝܬܗ:
ܕܢܘܚ ܡܫܪܐ ܕܐܬܦܪܫ.
ܕܢܫܒܩ ܒܗ ܠܕܪ̈ܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܓܒܪܘܢ ܥܠ ܚܡܪܐ܀

---

841. ܡܪ̈ܘܝܐ] read ܡܪܘܝܐ

ܥܡ ܕܟܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܕ̈ܡܘܗܝ܆
ܪܫܡ ܛܘܒܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܚܒܪܐ.
ܕܢܣܒܐ ܢܗܪ ܕܒܠܒܫܐ:
ܢܬܚܫܚܘܢ ܒܗ ܫܘܬܦ̈ܘܗܝ܀
ܢܘܚ ܕܨܒܐ ܠܚܠܝܫܐ:
ܕܢܛܪ ܥܒܘܬ ܪܚܡܢܐ.
ܕܢܫܦܠ ܒܗ ܠܕܪ̈ܐ:
ܕܬܫܪܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܡܠܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ܀
ܪܫܡ ܠܟ ܙܒܘܬ ܚܘܫܒܢܗ:
ܕܥܡܐ ܚܙܝ ܥܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܐܫܬܕܠ ܠܢܫ̈ܐ:
ܒܚܢܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܥܡܗ܀
ܢܛܪܗ ܒܒܢ̈ܐ ܕܡܡܘܠܐ:
ܘܒܥܒܕܗ ܚܠܦܬܐ ܠܒܪܝܬܐ.
ܘܥܘܢܗ̇ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܕܢܚܬܐ:
ܒܡܠܟ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܘܒܠ ܒܢܝܫܗ܀
ܐܦܝܣܗ ܡܢ ܠܗ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܦܬܪܗ̇ ܡܚܝܗ ܠܡܘܬܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܢܛܥܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܡܠ̈ܬܗ:
ܘܢܘܪܗ̇ ܒܫܡ ܐܠܗܐ܀
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒܝ ܦܬܪܬܗ̇:
ܒܐܘܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܚܛ̈ܗܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܥܠܬ ܚܛ̈ܗܐ:
ܥܠܬܐ ܕܛܒܝܢ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ܀
ܒܐܪܥܐ ܦܬܪܗ̇ ܠܡܘܬܐ:
ܒܐܠܗܐ ܕܫܕܪ ܒܗ ܒܡܘܫܐ.
ܕܢܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܛܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ:
ܒܡܕܪܗ ܒܒܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ܀
ܠܗ ܦܐܪ̈ܝ ܟܠ ܡܪ̈ܟܒܬܐ:
ܠܐܚܝܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܝ̈ܘܢ.
ܕܠܐ ܛܥܝܢ ܠܗ̇ ܠܡܕܒܪܬܗ:
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘ̈ܝ ܘܕܒܬܪ̈ܢ܀

---

872. ܕܡܘܒܠ] ܕܒܢ̈ܝ BCDE — 883. ܗܘܘ] ܗܘܐ D

ܘܩܕܡ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܥܒܕ ܠܗ:
ܘܒܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܩܪܒ ܟܠ.
ܘܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܠܗ * ܒܢܕܒܬܐ:
ܬܘܩܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ܀
ܫܪܐ ܕܡܢ ܟܠ ܢܬܦܫܢ:
ܗܘ ܡܘܒܠܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܒܕ ܩܪܒ ܒܫܡܘܬ ܡܢ ܪܢ:
ܡܬܗܐ ܠܟ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܟܠܠ̈ܬܐ܀

* f. 97v

---

890. ܩܪܒ ܟܠ] ܩܪܒ above line A, inv. BCDE — 896. stich foll. by ܥܠܡ BD

Homily III

On the Blessings Which Noah Gave His Sons

Sigla of Manuscripts

A = London, British Library, Oriental 5463
H = Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 588
I = Teheran, Neesan 1

ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܚܡܫܝܢ ܘܚܕ. ܥܠ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܕܝܗܒ ܢܘܚ ܠܒܢܘܗܝ.

ܐܪܙ ܛܒ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܚܙܝܬ ܒܟܬܒ̈ܐ:
ܕܡܒܕܩ ܠܗ ܢܒܝܐ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܐܪܙܢܝܬ.
ܪܘܚ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܓܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܒܟܬܒ ܘܪܘܚܢܐܝܬ:
ܕܢܓܠܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܟܣܐ ܒܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ.
ܒܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ ܟܣܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܫܘܪ̈ܪܘܗܝ:
ܘܥܡ ܡܫܠܡܘܗܝ ܡܬܚܒܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܠܐܚܪܝܢ.
ܒܘܗܝ ܟܣܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܚܫܒܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܡܗܝܡܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܘܒܚܫܘܗܝ ܡܬܝܠܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܒܘܗܝ.
ܚܘܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܒܓܠܦ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܒܡܕܒܪܗ ܕܐܕܡ:
ܕܟܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܒܠ ܚܝܐ ܒܚܛܗ̈ܘܗܝ ܡܚܝܘܬܗ.
ܒܡܗ ܕܡܒܕܪܗ ܪܕܬ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܕܡ̈ܘܗܝ؛
ܒܕܡܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܢܒܥܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܠ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܐܪܙܢܝܬ ܪܕܬ ܒܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܕܡ ܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܚܝܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܚܝܠ ܚܝܘܬܗ̇.
ܒܗܘܪܐܝܬ ܢܘܚܬ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܒܐܕܡ ܘܒܚܘܝܬ:
ܘܒܬܪ ܡܠܝܠ ܒܚܝܘܗܝ ܘܒܠܚܘܕܝ ܘܒܚܘܫ ܡܠܟܗ.
ܒܚܘܫ ܐܬܒܕܩ ܚܝܠ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܕܒܟܝܢ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܐܬܦܩܕܘ ܓܒܪ̈ܝ، ܕܝܢܐ ܕܒܦܘܪܫܢܐ.
ܠܟܝ ܐܬܢܒܝ ܕܒܚܘܫ ܢܚܘܐ ܚܠܒܐ ܚܫܝܫܐ:
ܘܒܚܘܫܬܗ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܠܘ̈ܛܬܐ.
ܒܗ ܗܘ ܒܪܢܐ ܫܠܚܬ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ، ܡܠܬܗ ܕܐܒܘܗ؛
ܕܐܚܣܢ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܒܗ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܕܒܪܟ ܢ ܠܒܢܘܗܝ.
ܡܥܒܕ ܚܝܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܕܡ̈ܘܗܝ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܒܢ̈ ܓܘܫܡܗ ܡܢ ܢܚܫܐ.
ܟܠܗܝܢ ܦܓܪܗ ܒܝܕ ܡܫܠܡܐ ܕܡܫܚܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܘܝܗܒ ܠܒܢܘܗܝ ܕܢܫܠܡܘܢ ܠܕܒܪܝܢ.

---

14. ܘܠܐ] ܠܐ HI

ܚܢܝܟܐܝܬ ܢܛܪܗ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܕܟܣܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ؛
ܘܒܒܘܣܡܐ ܦܬܚ ܒܫܘܠܡܗ ܦܘܡ ܡܠ̈ܬܗ.
ܪܘܚܐ ܫܒܚܗ ܠܨܒܪ ܒܡܬܪܗ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܬܘܒ ܐ݂ܠܨܗ ܕܢܣܡ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܟܠ ܡܕ̈ܒܪܢܘܗܝ.
ܚܝܠܗ ܚܝܠ ܠܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܙܘܥ̈ܝ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܘܐܒܕ ܡܟܐܒܢܐ ܕܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܪܚܡܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܡܠܘ̈ܬܐ ܗܘܘ ܡܕܒ̈ܪܢܘܗܝ، ܠܒܪܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ:
ܘܒܕܡܘܬ ܬܦܩܐ ܦܠܓ ܟ̈ܠܐ ܕܒܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ.
ܬܦܩܐ ܕܟ̈ܠܐ ܪܕܘ ܡܢ ܦܘܡܗ ܕܦܘܡܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ:
ܘܫܠܦ ܐܪܒܥܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܫܬܒܚܬܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܢܘܗܝ.
ܙܕܟܐ ܨܒܐ ܙܪܥ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܒܫܠܡܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ؛
ܘܡܬܚܫܚ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܡܠܟܝܘܗܝ، ܒܕܡܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ.
ܕܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘ ܘܦܫܝܛܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܗ:
ܘܒܚܕܘܬܐ ܡܒܪܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܒܪܘܝܐ ܕܚܒܐ ܒܪ ܒܝܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ:
ܕܫܠ ܘܒܪ̈ܟ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܠܬܠ̈ܬ ܒܫܡܗ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܐ݂ܣܡ ܒܗ ܒܡܬܪܐ ܕܪ݁ܐ ‿ ܠܚܒܪ ܐܚܘ̈ܗܝ؛
ܘܟܒܫ ܢܟܠܐ ܕܡܪܕܐ ܣܢܐ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܓܠܐ ܒܗ ܒܫܘܒܚܬܗ ܕܢܘܚ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܟܪܙ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܝ ܫܘܪܐ ܕܫܡܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܟܠܗ ܗܘ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܒܢܐ ܒܗ ܡܫܟܢܐ ܕܫܒܬܐ ܕܟܢܫ ܠܗ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ؛
ܘܐܚܝ ܒܫܝܢ * ܒܢܝ̈ܐ ܫܪ̈ܝܐ ܐܦ ܟ̈ܠܠܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܐܫܡܥ ܢܫܐ ܕܢܫܝܐ ܦܘܡ ܫܘ̈ܐ:
ܕܢܕܒܗ ‿ ܒܗ ܠܡܢܘܪܐ ܠܥܡܗ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܐܥܒܪ، ܒܗ ܚܝܠ ܚܛܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ:
ܕܐܒܕ ܡܢ ܦܘܡܗ ܡܟܐܒܢܐ ܕܡܚܒܠܐ ܣܢܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܒܪܗ ܐܕܡ ܕܢܛܪ ܠܐܕܡ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܢܒܠ ܒܠܘܡܣܐ ܕܗܒܪ ‿ ܐܒ، ܠܗܘ ܕܒܪܫܝܬ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܗ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ، ܕܗܘܬ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܠܒܐ ܙܕܐ ܒܠܘܡܣܐ ܕܒܪܘܝܘܬܗ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܕܐܫܬܡܥ ܒܗ ܒܪ ܢܘܚܐ ܕܝ ܠܗ ܠܡܗ:
ܘܦܬܚ ܥܡܠܝܗ ܒܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܒܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ.

* f. 253v

ܙܒܢ ܗܘ ܠܥܒܕ ܠܡܒܪܟܘ ܠܥܡ ܐܚܘܬܗ:
ܕܐܣܝ ܠܪܚܡܝ ܚܝܠ ܡܘܒܠܐ ܕܚܛܝ̈ܬܐ.
ܒܚܛܝܘܬܐ ܦܪܟ ܒܐܪ̈ܥܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܪܘܗܝ:
ܚܠܦ، ܦܪܟ ܠܥܡ ܐܠܗܗ ܘܐܟܡ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܒܪܝܟ ܠܡ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܗ ܕܫܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܛܝܘܬܐ:
ܘܟܠ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܫܡ ܘܠܐ [ܗܘܐ] ܕܐܠܦ ܐܦ ܙܕܝܩܐ.
ܐܢܬ ܡܫܝܚ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܡܠ̈ܬܟ ܐܒܐ ܒܐܢܐ:
ܒܠܝܟ ܗܢܡ ܠܗܘܕܡ ܥܡ ܐܠܗܟ ܘܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܠ̈ܬܝܟ.
ܫܕܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܒܪܟܬ ܒܪ ܠܒܢܝܟ ܒܐܢܐ ܒܐܪܙ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܟ:
ܘܛܠܝܟ ܒܘܕܡܐ ܕܡܒܕܡ ܫܕܬܐ ܡܬܟܒܕܡ ܒܗ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܐܠܗܗ ܕܫܡ ܐܬܒܪ ܢܒܝܐ ܕܦܘܫܬܐ:
ܘܡܬܬܦܩ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܒܪܒܘܬ ܒܡܬܪܐ ܕܐܘܪܬ ܠܒܪܗ.
ܠܝܦܬ ܠܡ ܢܦܬܐ ܘܢܫܪܐ ܒܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܫܡ ܡܫܝܚܐ:
ܘܠܚܡ ܢܟܒܕ ܒܒܪܐ ܠܐܚܘ̈ܗܝ، ܘܢܦܠܘܚ ܐܢܘ ‿.
ܠܫܡ ܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܘܠܝܦܬ ܢܦܬܐ ܘܠܚܡ ܒܒܪܐ:
ܐܣܟܝ̈ܡܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܕܒܢܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܡܫܝܢ.
ܚܕ ܥܡ ܡܪܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܘܚܕ ܒܒܪܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ‿ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܦܘܡܐ ܒܬܠܬ ܡܠ̈ܝܢ.
ܠܬܠܬ ܡܩ̈ܫܝܢ ܦܠܓ ܦܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܡܒܠܠ ܥܦܪ:
ܘܒܪ ‿ ܐܝܟ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܥܘܡܩܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ.
ܬܠܬܐ ܥܒܕ̈ܝܢ ܐܘܚܕ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܐܒܐ ܒܐܢܐ:
ܘܠܚܕ ܐܘܪܟ ܘܠܬܪܝܢ [ܒܪ،] ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܒܪܗ.
ܬܫܒܚܬ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܓܒܪ ܠܒܪܘܪܐ ܘܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܢܝܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܢܬܘܬܗ ܐܣܝܡ ܐܢܘ ‿ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܐܣܟܝ̈ܡܝܢ.
ܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܟ̈ܠܐ ܚܡܫܐ ܠܫܠܐ ܕܒܪܟܗ ܡܠ̈ܘܗܝ؛
ܘܦܩܕ ܥܡ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܒܠ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܦܪܟܗ.
ܠܝܬ ܠܗ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܠܥܡ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܐ ‿ ܐܝܟ ܢܒܝܐ:
ܕܗܐ ܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܒܘܗ، ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܝܟ ܫܡ.
ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܠܘܛܬܐ ܕܠܓܠ ܠܐܚܪܝܢܐ ܦܪܝܫܐ ܠܗ:
ܕܗܐ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܓܠܓ ܕܐܚܘܗܝ، ܒܪ ܚܡ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܚܡ.
ܕܫܡ ܢܗܒ ܒܘܪܟܬܗ ܠܥܡ ܒܪܘܝܐ ܕܒܠ ܡܒܠ:
ܘܕܚܡ ܢܣܒ ܠܠܘܛܬܐ ܕܓܒܠܗ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܒܗܒܪܗ.

---

61. ܒܐܪ̈ܥܐ] read ܒܐܪܥܐ as H — 64. [ܗܘܐ]] om. AI, read as H — 67. ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܟ] ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ H — 80. ܘܠܬܪܝܢ] ܘܠܚܕ H | [ܒܪ،]] om. A, blank space of one word I, read as H

ܒܚܝ̈ܠܝ ܡܠܬ̈ܝܟ ܐܘ ܙܕܝܩܐ ܘܡܫܡܠܢ ܥܒ̈ܕܝܟ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܩܐܡ ܥܠ ܫܘܡܠܐ ܕܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܟ.
ܒܥܐ ܫܘܡܠܝܟ ܘܡܟܒܕ. ܫܓܫ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܕܠܝܠܐ ܠܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬ̈ܝܟ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܥܐ.
ܠܐ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܟ ܢܦܩܢ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܡܬܒܪ̈ܟܢܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܠܘ̈ܛܬܟ ܡܚܬ̈ܡܢ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܡܬܠܛ̈ܛܢܐ.
ܒܚܝܠܬ ܕܡܪܟ ܠܥܒܕ ܕܐܫܬܥܒܕܗ ܒܫܡ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܡܟܐ * ܕܐܬܚܝܒܬ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܠܥܒܕܗ̇ ܡܫܡܠܬܗ̇ ܠܒܢܘܗ̇. * f. 254r
ܒܢܬ ܬܘܒ ܕܬܠܬܟ ܠܚܡ ܫܡܝܢܐ [ܕ]ܚܡ ܒܫܠܝܛܘܬܐ:
ܘܒܪ. ܡܚܝܕ ܐܢܬ ܐܝܫܬ ܠܒܪܗ ܒܢܫܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܢܦܪܘܢ ܠܦܘܬ ܫܘܒܚܟ:
ܠܐ ܡܒܪܟܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܒܘܫܐ ܒܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ.
ܕܝܐܐ ܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܠܕܠܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܐܢܬ ܒܠܝ ܒܢܝܢ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܕܡܒܠܠ ܐܢܬ ܐܠܐ ܐܣܝܪܐ.
ܕܡܒܝܐ ܕܐܣܝܪ ܒܢܐ ܠܒܝܪܟ ܠܐܡܟܐ ܕܝܟܐ:
ܘܡܛܪܐܝܬ ܢܦܩ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܐܡܟܐ ܕܡܚܝܢ.
ܒܗ̇ ܕܙܕܝܩܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܢܝܟ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ:
ܘܐܢ ܡܬܬܟܒܬ ܕܬܟܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܒܩܘܡ ܡܢܝܟ.
ܒܩܘܡ ܡܢܝܟ ܠܘ ܗܘܐ ܕܒܩܘܡ ܐܠܐ ܕܒܥܬ̈ܝ:
ܘܗܘܦ ܬܗܪܐ ܕܬܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܒܥܐ ܡܢܝܟ.
ܐܪܙܐ ܪܒܐ ܒܥܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܟ ܠܒܪܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܟ ܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܕܠܒܢܝܟ ܥܒܕܐ ܒܠܫ ܕܢܬܒܪܡ.
ܫܠܝܘܬ ܢܫ̈ܐ ܡܠܝܡ ܦܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܒܪ ܡܫܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܠܟ ܫܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ ܡܟܦܪܐ ܡܚܡܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܘܬܐ.
ܬܗܪܐ ܗܘ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܟܒ ܠܒܢܝܟ ܒܦܘܡܗ [ܕ]ܐܕܡ:
ܘܠܟ ܐܦ ܒܢܫܐ ܕܡܫܝ̈ܚܐ ܬܗܘܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܟ ܐܦ ܕܝܢ:
ܕܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ ܫܠܝܛܬ ܠܘ̈ܛܬܐ ܘܥܡܝܩܬ ܐܝܟ.
ܒܐܠܗ ܚܠܐ ܡܕܒܢܬ ܠܒܪܐ ܒܥܪܘܬ ܡܠܬܟ:
ܕܫܘܩܐ ܠܙܪܥܗ ܠܒܠܬܐ ܘܫܒܝܬܐ ܠܡܫܠܡܘ.
ܙܒܢܗ ܢܒܥܝܟ ܠܡܕܡܘ ܒܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ:
ܡܢ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܕܡܝܢ ܒܫܘܚܠܦ ܡܠܬ̈ܝܟ.

---

94. ܘܠܐ] ܕܠܐ H — 96. ܕܡܬܠܛ̈ܛܢܐ] ܕܡܬܬܠܛ̈ܛܢܐ H — 99. [ܕ]ܚܡ] ܕ illegible in A, read as HI — 109. ܠܘ] ܠܐ HI — 110. [ܕ]ܒܥܐ] ܕ unclear in A, read as HI — 115. [ܕ]ܐܕܡ] in. ܕ unclear in A, read as HI

ܕܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܒܫܬ ܒܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܟ:
ܘܗܘ ܗܪ ܒܗܡ ܒܟ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܕܚܕ ܫܘܡܠܐ.
ܚܕ ܫܘܡܠܐ ܒܥܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܗ ܕܒܪ ܠܒܢܝܟ ܒܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܚܕ ܢܫܐ ܚܝܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܦܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ
ܢܫܐ ܕܡܫܡܠܬܐ ܗܪ̈ܝ ܠܗ ܡܫܡܠܬܐ ܠܐܢܫ ܘܡܫܡܠܬܐ:
ܘܫܢܐ ܠܡܫܡܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܕܝܠܗ ܡܫܡܠܬܐ.
ܥܙܪܐ ܚܠܝܐ ܙܟܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܠܝܐ ܥܙܪܐ ܕܥܒܕܗ:
ܕܢܣܘܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܥܪܘܬܗ ܒܦܘܡ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܒܦܘܡ ܢܘܚ ܢܫܬ ܡܠܬ ܡܫܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܡܥܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܘܒܣܦܘ̈ܬܗ ܙܡܪܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܬܡܠܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܥܡ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܙܕܬ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܙܪ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܒܝܕ ܙܘܓܗ̇ ܚܕܢܐ ܕܡܠܠܬ ܠܠܒܐܡ ܦܓܪܗ.
ܒܦܓܪܗ ܘܢܦܫܗ ܥܪܬ ܫܘܬܐ ܡܚܫܚܬ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܡܚܒܒܐ ܐܫܦܪ ܕܐܡܗ̇ ܒܠ ܙܥ ܡܠܕܘܗܝ
ܡܫܝܚܐ ܥܙܪܐ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܐܪ̈ܙܢܐ ܐܪܙܢܝܬ:
ܘܡܗܒ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܐܒܪܗܡ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ.
ܠܒܢܝܗ ܐܫܠܡ ܫܘܒܚܬ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܚܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ:
ܕܝܐܐ ܕܡܢܒ ܠܡܦܠܓ ܚܐ̈ܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܢܚܫ̈ܐ.
ܠܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ ܥܒܕ ܬܢܝܬ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܪܥܘܬܗ:
ܕܡܒܒܕܗܘܢ ܢܫܬܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܡܫܘܚܬ ܫܢ̈ܐ.
ܫܢ̈ܐ ܦܠܓ ܡܢ ܫܢܘܬܗ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܪܗ:
ܘܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܦܠܓ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ.
ܐܪܙܢܝܬ ܢܘܗܝ ܐܢܘܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ:
ܕܠܒܢܐ ܕܚܠܝܡ ܢܦܘܠܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܕܠܐ ܦܐܡ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܗܘܝ ܒܕܢ ܠܫܡ ܘܠܫܢܬ ܗܘܝܬ ܥܝܢ ܪܒܐ:
ܕܒܪ ܠܐ ܒܠܝ ܚܡ * ܢܦܪܘܢ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܒܡܫܡܫܢܐ. * f. 254v
ܠܒܘܪܟܐ ܢܛܪ ܠܐ ܕܡܒܢܪ ܠܗܝ ܕܟܝܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܘܟܪ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܫܢܝܬ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܟܠ.
ܠܘ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܦܠܓ ܐܡܘܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܟܐܢܘܬܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܠܐܪܙܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܒܢܒܝܘܬܗ.
ܠܘ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܪܫ ܦܠܓ ܡܠܘ̈ܗܝ ܠܬܠܬ ܡܘܫ̈ܚܢ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܫܘܐ ܠܪܚܡ ܡܠܕ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ.

---

133. ܡܢ] ܥܡ H

ܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܘܥܒܕ. ܟܠ ܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܗܘ ܐܡܪܗ̇: 155
ܘܓܙܪ ܗܘܐ ܟܠ ܕܢܐܡܪܝܘܗ̇ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗ̇ ܠܗܘܬ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܗ̇.
ܡܪܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ، ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܬ ܟܠ [ܟܠ]:
ܘܡܬܒܠܥܝܗ̇ ܢܦܫ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܘܢܦܠ ܐܪܙܐ.
ܒܪܝܘܬܗ ܒܪ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܕ ܓܠܐ ܠܗ ܟܠ:
ܘ ܓܠܐ ܘܚܘܝܗ ܐܪܙܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܦܘܡ ܐܢܫܐ. 160
ܒܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ ܒܪܐ ܕܡܫܪܪ ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ:
ܘܝܗܒ ܒܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ.
ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܦܬܚ ܐܦܘܗ ܡܠܬ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܐܪܝܡ ܡܠܬܗ ܘܐܟܪܙ ܡܫܬܐ ܕܐܬܒܕܩ ܠܗ.
ܒܢܘܚܐ ܦܬܚܗ ܠܐܪܙ ܒܕܘܩܐ ܕܐܬܒܕܩ ܠܗ: 165
ܘܨܝܪ ܗܟܢ ܒܪܒܘܬ ܛܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܬܗܪܐ ܪܒܐ ܡܢ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܒܥܘܪ، ܡܠܬܗ:
ܕܐܡܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܟ ܕܢܣܒ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕ ܐܡܪ ܬܗܪ ܐܦ ܐܒܘܗܘ، ܕܒܪܗ ܕܐܡܪ:
ܕܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܪ ܓܐ ܩܠܡ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܢܝܐ ܥܡܠܐ. 170
ܒܬܗܪܐ ܕܕܢܚܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܒܡܬܚܢܬܐ ܕܡܪܢܐ ܡܪ:
ܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܢܘܚ ܟܕ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܐܬܒܕܩ ܠܗ.
ܕܘܝ. ܬܗܪ ܗܘܐ ܘܪܒ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܒܒܢܪ ܡ̈ܠܐ:
ܘܢܘܚ ܐܬܕܟܪ ܘܐܘܠܕ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܪܕܐ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ.
ܒܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܒܗ ܬܗܪ ܘܐܬܕܟܪ ܦܘܪܫܐܝܬ: 175
ܕܒܪܐ ܪܚܡ ܡܢ ܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܣܪܐ.
ܒܥܘܕ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܬܗܪ ܣܚܝܦܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܫܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܐܫܦܠ ܡܠܬܗ ܡܢ ܡܗܡܢܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܦܬܚ ܦܩܘܕܬܗ ܘܒܪܟܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܒܪܝܟ ܪ، ܒܡܪܐ:
ܘܗܦܟܗ̇ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܕܒܪܝܟ ܐܠܗܗ ܕܫܡ. 180
ܡܢ ܛܘܒܗ ܠܒܪܗ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܒܪܟܘ:
ܘܡܢ ܗܘ، ܬܗܪܐ ܘܦܪܢ ܠܥܡܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܒܒܪܟܬܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܟܐܢܐ ܕܒܪܝܟ؛
ܘܣܒܥܗ ܠܒܪܗ ܠܟܗ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܡܪܗ.
ܒܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܕܡܪܗ ܢܛܠ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܕܒܪܗ: 185
ܒܕܡܗܝܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܫܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܗܘ ܟܠܗ.

---

156. ܕܐܡܪܗ̇] ܕܐܡܪܐ I — 157. ܡܪܐ] before corr. prec. by ܘܓܙܪ ܗܘܐ ܟܠ (dit.) | [ܟܠ]] om. A, read as HI — 160. ܘܚܘܝܗ] om. in. ܘ I

ܒܪܝܟ ܐܠܗܗ ܕܒܪ، ܕܝ ܟܐ ܒܗ ܘܦܪܝܫ، ܒܫܡܗ:
ܘܒܪܝܟ ܐܦ ܒܪ، ܕܒܫܡܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܪܗ ܘܒܪܗ.
ܒܗܘ ܕܒܫܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܒܪܗ ܬܗܪ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܘܕ، ܘܐܡܪ:
ܕܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܒܬܗ. ܕܝܠܟܐ ܒܒܪ، ܡܪܘܬܗ. 190
ܗ̇، ܕܒܬܗܕܐ ܓܠܐ ܠܗ ܡܪܗ ܠܒܪܐ ܛܠܝܐ:
ܠܘ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܠܐ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܐܪܙܢܝܬ.
ܡܢ ܡܠ̈ܬܗ ܒܬܪ. ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܡܫܢܐ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܟܠܗ̇، ܬܗܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܢܘ ܠܡܢܘ ܒܬܪ. ܕܢܙܪ.
ܡܢ ܥܡܡ ܒܬܪ. ܗܘܐ ܕܢܩܘܡ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܒܠܝܢ ܟܠ ܟܠ: 195
ܟܠ ܦܩܕ ܗ̇، ܘܓܒ. ܠܐܚܘܗ̈ܝ، ܒܢܝܪܐ ܕܫܥܒܕܗ.
ܘܐܠܐ ܠܡܒܢܐ ܠܐ ܝܗܒ ܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ:
ܠܐ ܠܝܦܬ * ܕܐܦܬ، ܘܠܐ ܠܚܡ ܕܓܒܪ. ܒܓܒܪܐ ܕܓܒ̈ܪܐ. * f. 255r
ܠܚܡ ܠܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܗ ܠܝܦܬ ܢܬܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܟܢܥܢ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܝܗܒ ܠܗ ܕܢܦܬܐ ܘܢܐܪܒ ܒܢܬܘܬ ܐܚܘܗ̈ܝ. 200
ܠܚܡ ܓܪ. ܠܛܠܗ ܠܚܡ ܠܐ ܕܢܫܡܗ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܪܫܡ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܫܒܗ ܒܓܠܗ ܢܬܘܬܐ ܕܐܚ̈ܐ ܒܪ̈ܟܬܐ.
ܠܚܡ ܠܐ ܦܪܥܗ ܒܓܙܪ ܕܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܟܢܥܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܦܩ [ܠܗ] ܠܡܬܠܛܠܘ ܒܡܢ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܘܗܝ.
ܠܚܡ ܠܐ ܓܙܪ ܠܘܛܬܐ ܕܟܠܘܗ، ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ: 205
ܘܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܠܐܚܘܗ، ܐܝܟ ܕܒܬܡܟܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܡܠܦ ܕܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܙܪܥܗ ܕܚܡ ܒܒܪܘܬܐ:
ܠܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܫܡ ܒܡܒܪܟܐ ܒܪܟܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܝܦܬ.
ܒܢ̈ܝ ܫܡ ܐܡܪܢ ܕܐܡܠܟܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܪܝܟܘܬܐ:
ܘܕܫܪܝܐ ܢܐܡܪ. ܗܫܐ ܕܒܪ ܫܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. 210
ܢܐܡܪ. ܦܬܠ ܪܫܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܠܟܘܬ ܪܒܐ:
ܘܦܩܕ ܡܪܝܐ ܡܣܝܡ ܠܗ̇ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܓܒܪܘܬܗ.
ܗܘ ܠܡ ܢܐܡܪ. ܗܘܐ ܓܒܪܐ ܚܣܝܢܬܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܐܚܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܗ ܪܫܝܘܬܐ.
ܘܐܚܘܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܒܒܪܗ ܠܢܐܡܪ. ܓܒܪ ܚܝܠܐ: 215
ܠܘܛܬܐ ܡܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܥܒܝܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܡܠܠܬ.
ܒܢ̈ܝ ܫܡ ܐܘܢ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܪ̈ܒܐ ܘܒܢܝܢ̈ܐ:
ܘܠܘ ܕܐܫܬܥܒܕܘ ܡܣܘܐ ܒܗܕܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܫܥܒܕܘ.

---

196. ܦܩܕ ܗ̇،] read inv. as H — 204. [ܠܗ]] om. A, read as HI — 214. ܪܫܝܘܬܐ] corr. from ܠܫܝܘܬܐ (dit.)

ܐܦܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܢܘܚ ܕܦܠܓܗ ܒܐܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ، ܠܒܪܬܗ ܕܐܪܥܐ:
ܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܘܙܒܗ ܠܚܝܠܗ ܫܬܐܬܐܬ.
ܦܠܠ ܘܡܫܬܐ ܢܝܐ ܠܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܒܦܠܓܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܕܒܪܗ:
ܘܐܘܕܝ، ܠܒܪܗ ܕܫܘܙܒܗ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܡܘܒܕܢܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܥܒܕ ܠܗ ܠܦܫܩܐ ܡܢ ܪܚܡܗ:
ܘܦܫܚ ܒܦܘܡܗ ܣܘܟܠܐܝܬ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܬܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܗ̇ܝ، ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ:
ܕܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܗ ܕܫܝܡ ܕܟܢܥܢ ܥܒܕܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢܡܘܣܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܝ ܠܟ ܕܒܪܗ:
ܘܦܪܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܬܪܝܢ ܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ، ܕܗܘ ܐܬܒܥܘ.
ܒܒܪܟܬܐ ܘܠܘܛܬܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܪܗ:
ܕܢܬܘܒܘܢ ܚܘܪܐ ܕܚܛܝܢܘܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܢܚܐ.
ܠܝܦܬ ܡܠܟ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܬܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܘܢܥܒܪ̈ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܫܩܠ ܠܡܐܟܠ. ܒܡܫܟܢܐ ܕܕܪܐ ܕܫܝܡ.
ܠܫܝܡ ܡܘܬܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܪܒܐ ܒܬܦܠܐ ܕܡܪܘܬܗ:
ܘܢܠܒܟ ܒܢܐ ܕܦܠܚܝ ܫ̈ܡܐ ܕܒܫܡܐ ܒܐܚܘܗܝ،
ܒܒܪܟܬܐ ܘܠܘܛܬܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܦܠܓ ܡܠܬܗ:
ܕܟܠܐ ܕܢܚܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܟܕ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܢܦܩܘܢ ܒܡܠܬܗ.
ܡܢ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܪܚܝܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܐܝܐ:
ܕܟܠܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢ ܢܗܘܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܒܦܐܝܘܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܒܦܐܝܘܬ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܕܢܚܐ ܦܩܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܪ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܕܢܝ ܘܦܘܢܝܗܝ، ܡܢ ܚܝܠܝܗܘܢ.
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܚܙܝܗܝ، ܫܝܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܦܐܝܐ:
ܘܡܬܐܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܝܚܘܗܝ، ܒܦܬܪ ܕܠܐ ܬܫܦܝܬܐ.
ܒܦܬܪܐ ܕܒܪܗ ܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܦܘܪܥܢܐ:
ܘܡܬܚܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܒܗ ܡܢܗ ܒܚܣܐ ܒܘܢܐܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܣܝܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܫܝܡ ܡܢ ܒܪ̈ܟܬܗ:
ܘܒܒܐ ܕܫܥܪ ܬܘܒ ܫܥܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ.
ܒܫܡ ܡܫܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܫܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܘܪܚܡܘܗܝ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܫܘܦܐ ܒܪܝܫܝܬ ܦܠܓܐ ܒܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܗ.
ܬܪܬܝܢ ܡܢܗ̈ܝܢ ܒܗܘܢ ܠܫܪܒܐ ܕܒܟܘܪܘܬܐ:
ܘܗܕܐ ܒܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܡܠܕܗ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ.

---

280. ܕܫܘܦܐ] ܕܫܦܐ H

ܥܒܕܐ ܕܥܒܕ̈ܐ ܥܒܕܗ ܠܟܢܥܢ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ:
ܘܗܕܐ ܐܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܦܘܪܫ ܚܘܒܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ.
285 ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܒܪܗ ܐܫܪ ܐܒܘܢ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܕܝܢܝܢ ܬܚܝܬ ܡܪܘܬܐ ܕܡܪܗ ܘܡܪܗ.
ܠܡܪܗ ܘܡܪܗ ܥܒܕ ܟܠܒܟܐ ܒܪ ܫܡ ܘܝܦܬ:
ܐܝܟ ܕܟܢ ܕܚܡܡ ܕܒܗܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܟܠܐ.
ܥܠ ܚܡ ܟܠܐ ܟܬܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܠܘܚ ܠܥܒܕܐ ܕܡܚܝܗ:
290 ܟܠܗܝ ܒܕܝܢܗ ܠܢ ܘܪܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܝܫܐ ܕܒܪܗ.
ܒܦܠܚܘܬ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܟܠܗ ܐܦܠܚ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
* f. 256r
ܘܠܒܪ ܐܒܘܢ ܟܬܒ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ * ܕܢܦܠܚܘܢ ܟ̈ܠܗ.
ܠܟܢܐ ܕܟ̈ܠܐ ܐܪܟܝ ܒܪ ܠܚܡܝ ܥܠ ܫܡ ܘܥܠ ܝܦܬ:
ܘܫܠܦ ܐܝܟ ܠܦܘܬ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ.
295 ܐܦܣܘ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܘܪܟܬܐ ܘܠܘܛܬܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܬܪܝܗܘܢ:
ܟܕ ܠܒ ܦܪ̈ܫܝܢ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܡܗܐ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܫܘ̈ܡܝ.
ܚܕ ܗܘ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܬܪܝܗܘܢ ܘܚܕ ܫܘܒܠܐ:
ܒܗܝ ܕܐܦ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܡܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܒܚܕܐ.
ܬܪܬܝܢ ܒܚܕܐ ܦܠܓ ܟܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܠܬܪܝܢ:
300 ܠܒܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡ ܠܫܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܝܦܬ ܢܟܦܐ.
ܠܒܪܐ ܚܒܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܪܗ:
ܘܠܒܪ ܐܡ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܚܫܝܫ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ.
ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܟܢܐ ܕܥܡܡ ܟܬܒܐ ܒܬܪ ܫܡ ܐܦ ܝܦܬ:
ܘܠܗ ܐܫܬܥܒܕܘ ܫܘܒܚܐܝܬ ܘܦܠܚܐܝܬ.
305 ܡܛܠ ܡܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܢܦܠ ܠܒܪܐ ܕܦܠܚܘܬ ܐܚܘܗܝ:
ܘܫܡ ܒܦܠܚܘܬܐ ܚܝ ܡܗܝ ܘܠܒܪܗ ܕܢܦܠܘܚ ܠܐܚܘܗ̈ܝ.
ܒܥܡ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܝܗܒ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܠܚܒܝܒܝ ܢܦܫܐ:
ܘܒܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܓܪܢ ܠܣܬܪܐ ܬܚܝܬ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ.
ܕܕܡܟܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܫܦܪ ܐܦ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܒܟܬܝ̈ܒܬܗ:
310 ܘܥܒܕ ܥܒܕ̈ܐ ܘܒܢ̈ܝ ܚܐܪ̈ܐ ܠܡܪܢܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ.
ܟܠ ܠܡ ܥܒܕܐ ܡܚܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܦܪܝܩ ܡܢ ܛܠܝܘܬܐ:
ܐܦ ܒܪ ܚܐܪ̈ܐ ܥܒܕܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܡܪܢܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ.
ܘܐܢܫܘܗܝ ܕܦܠܓܘܬ ܒܪܢ ܟܠ ܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܬܚܝܬ ܚܕ ܡܪܢܐ:
ܡܢ ܢܬܦܠܓ ܟܠ ܡܟܠܬ ܢܘܚ ܕܠܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܝ.

---

291. ܡܠܟܐ] add. in. ܕ I — 295. ܠܬܪܝܗܘܢ] add. sey. H — 296. ܟܕ] read ܘܟܕ as H — 297. ܕܒܬܪܝܗܘܢ] add. sey. H — 299. ܠܬܪܝܢ] ܠܐܚܝܢ H — 313. ܟܠ] read ܥܠ as H

315 ܘܕܗܟܢܐ ܗܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ ܟܬܒܐ ܫܦܝܪ:
ܘܡܪܕܝܢ ܐܢܕܐ ܐܦ ܙܕ̈ܝܩܐ ܕܒܬܪ ܒܬܪ.
ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܢܘܚ ܩܒܠ ܐܒܪܗܡ ܡܘܠܕܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܠܒܪܗ ܠܐܝܣܚܩ ܕܕܝܠܗ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܡܠܕ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܬܪܝܢ ܐܘܠܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܗܘܕܟܗ̈ܝ ܡܠܝܢ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ:
320 ܘܐܫܡܪ ܐܢܝ ܙܪܥܐ ܕܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܢܐ ܠܕܝܢܗ.
ܠܐܒܪܗܡ ܐܫܠܡ ܙܪܥܘܬܐ ܕܩܒܠ ܡܢ ܫܡ:
ܘܠܒܪ ܗܘ ܠܒ ܒܕܝܢܗ ܒܝܫܐ ܕܢܦܠܘܚ ܐܝܟ ܫܡ.
ܒܗܘܢ ܒܪ ܟܐܢܐ ܕܠܚܕ ܬܪܝܢ ܘܠܚܕ ܥܒܕܐ:
ܘܥܠܡ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܢܬܒܚܪ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܒܚܢܐ.
325 ܠܗ ܠܗܢ ܢܣܒܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܐܦ ܐܝܣܚܩ ܒܪ ܡܘܠܟܢܐ:
ܘܫܬܬܐܝܬ ܕܪܝ ܒܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܫܘܒܚܢܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܢܘܚ ܘܐܒܪܗܡ ܫܦܪܝ ܡ ܡܠܕ̈ܗܝ ܒܬܪܗ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܒܘܪ̈ܟܬܐ ܕܬ̈ܠܬܝܢ ܬܗܪܐ.
ܠܝܥܩܘܒ ܢܛܪ ܒܡܫܡܫܬܐ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܫ:
330 ܘܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܬܚܝܬܝ ܗܡܟܢ ܒܪܝ ܟܠܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܫܡ.
ܠܒܫܘ ܐܦܪ ܕܐܒܘܗܘ ܕܬܬܘܒ ܡܬܝܪ ܐܝܬ:
ܘܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܟܕ ܡܚܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܗܐ ܡܚܝܪ ܗܘܐ.
ܠܐ ܐܫܬܟܚ ܒܗܘ ܠܡܫܡܫ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܫܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܙܪܥܗ ܦܠܚ ܒܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܠܡܫ̈ܠܛܢܐ.
335 ܟܬܗܪܐ ܗܘ̈ܝܢ ܡܠܟ̈ܐ ܒܐܢ̈ܐ ܕܒܬ̈ܘܟܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܕܪ ܠܡܬܗܪ ܥܫܦܪ ܒܡܫܟܢܗܘܢ.
ܚܠ ܗܝܟܠܐ ܫܠ ܐܘܢ ܠܡܫܬܟܠܘ:
ܕܐܡܟ ܝܢ ܘܪܘܢ ܗܘܒܠ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܒܕܪܟܐ ܕܬ̈ܠܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܝ ܡ̈ܬܐ ܝ ܡܬ، ܝ ܠܦ̈ܬܐ ܕܒܬܡ̈ܬܬܐ:
340 ܝ ܘܪ ܕܡܬ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܠܬ̈ܬܐ ܒܝܬ ܚܠܬܬܐ.
ܐܘ ܫܪ̈ܟܐ ܫܘܪ̈ܝ ܡܪܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܡܦܩܝܢ ܒܗ:
* f. 256v
* ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܫܪܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܬܘܒ ܕܡܬ̈ܬܗ ܡܕܡ ܫܪ̈ܟܐ.
ܐܘ ܒܬܘܠܐ ܕܟܝܪܘ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܒܪܢܐ:
ܘܟܕܠܐ ܢܬܐ ܟܠܗ ܐܪܙ ܕܢܣܡ ܒܝܬ ܐܪ̈ܒܝܐ.
345 ܐܘ ܗܕ̈ܝܐ ܕܕܪܫܘ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܡܐܬܝܬܗ ܡܠܟܐ:
ܘܗܡܟܐ ܒܗ ܡܠ̈ܟܐ ܬ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܝ ܐܬܐ ܕܥܫܢܐ.

---

320. ܐܢܝ] read ܐܝܠܝܢ — 328. ܒܐܣܟܡܐ] ܟܐܣܟܡܐ H — 336. ܒܡܫܟܢܗܘܢ] add. sey. H — 340. ܚܠܬܬܐ] read ܚܠܬ̈ܬܐ as H

ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܢܫܒܐ ܗ̄ܘ̣، ܡܠܝ̈ܗܘܢ ܕܡܠܝ̈ܢ ܢܫܒܐ:
ܘܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܦܠܓ ܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܚܣܐ ܗܠܟ̈ܐ.
ܦܘܬܝܐ ܕܝܗܒܐ ܒܗ ܒܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ ܠܬܪܬܝܢ ܐܪ̈ܥܬܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܣܡܘܢ ܒܚܣܡ ܡܚܪܐ ܚܘܪ̈ܒܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ.
ܠܚܕ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܚܕ ܦܪܘܫܐ ܥܠܝܗ ܥܩܐܝܬ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܦܠܓܘ ܥܠ ܡܘܒܠܐ ܕܡܕܪܐ ܕܥܡܗܘܢ.
ܡܕܪܐ ܦܠܓܐ ܥܡܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܢ ܡܕܪܐ ܠܡܡܕܪܘ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܕܒܬܪܗ..
ܢܘܚ ܡܕܒܪܬ ܕܪܫܡ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܢܝܗ ܒܠܗܘܢ ܒܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ ܕܦܠܓ ܦܘܡܗ.
ܒܦܘܡܗ ܫ̇ܠܝܛ ܡܠܠ ܗܘܝܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܡܕܪܐ:
ܘܡܠܝܗ ܙ̇ܕܐ ܒܥܡܠܐ ܕܡܗܠܟ ܚܝ̈ܐ.
ܐܘ ܗܠܟܐ ܕܫ̇ܠܝܛ ܦܘܡܗ ܚܠܦ ܗܠܟ̈ܬܗ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܫ̇ܠܝܛ ܡܥܢܫ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ ܒܪܝ ܠܥܝܢܗ.
ܐܘ ܗܕܝܐ ܕܢܘܚ، ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܠܟ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܫܡ ܒܗ ܡܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܒܦܫ̈ܩܬܐ.
ܐܘ ܠܟ ܒܪܐ ܕܙ̇ܕܐ ܥܦܪ ܒܡܒܕܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܕܡܒܒܬ ܡܠܬܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ.
ܡܥ̇ܒ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܒܥܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܘܚܟ ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ:
ܘܦܬܚ ܥܝܢܝܟ ܥܠ ܚܘܬܗ ܒܚܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܬ̈ܟ.
ܒܒܗܪܟ ܥܒܝܬ ܥܡܝܩܬܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܚܬܐ:
ܘܬܗ̣ܪ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܡܬܒܡܘ ܒܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܒܪܟ.
ܒܬܗܪܐ ܪܒܐ ܡܚܒ ܚܘܫ̈ܒܝܟ ܒܥܩܪܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܝܟ:
ܕܣܓܝܬ [ܕܐܠܗܝܢ] ܒܡܘܒ̈ܠ ܦܓܪܗ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܗܘܢܐ ܚܙܬ ܒܗ̇ ܒܗ̇، ܚܘܒܬܐ ܡܚܣܝܬ ܒܠܐ:
ܘܚܙܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܕܚܣܝܘܢ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܣܝܢܘܬ.
ܒܚܫܝܫܘܬܐ ܚܙܬ ܡܠܬܟ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܕܒܥܝܢ:
ܘܠܬ ܘܚܪܗ ܒܥܩܬ ܦܘܡܐ ܕܚܝܐ ܕܐܢܫ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܒܐܝܬ ܥܩܒܪܗ ܐܬܚܙܬ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܪܘܚܟ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܡ ܡܢ ܐܘ ܕܡܕ̈ܬܗ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܐ ܡܬܒܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܟ:
ܟܕ ܡܢ ܢܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܢ ܠܗ ܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܒܥܡ ܐܠܗܐ.

---

363. ܒܡܒܕܐ] ܠܡܒܕܐ H — 370. [ܕܐܠܗܝܢ] om. AI, read as H — 372. ܘܚܙܬ] read ܘܚܙܝܬ

ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܫܚܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܝܟ ܥܡ ܐܠܗܟ:
ܘܪܥܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܗ̇ܘ، ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ.
ܒܪܝܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܗ ܡܪܝܐ ܪܒ ܡܢ ܐܬ̈ܐ:
ܕܬܡܢ ܐܘ ܒܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܡܢ ܠܡ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܣܓܝܢ ܠܗ.
ܒܫܘܒܚܬ ܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬ ܡܪܟ ܒܪܟܬ ܡܠܬ̈ܟ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܦܪܚܝܢ ܛܠܝܢ ܠܛܠܝܐ ܕܐܬܐ ܐܝܠܢ.
ܫܡܪܐ ܛܠܝܐ ܛܒܪ ܒܗ ܛܠܝܐ ܡܢ ܛܠܝܘܬܗ:
ܘܐܝܬ ܐܪܚܡܬܗ، ܒܦܓܪܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܕܢܛܪ ܐܝܠܢ.
ܫܒܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܒܪܟ ܫܒܝܚܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܬ̈ܟ:
ܕܡܬܪܬ ܒܘܪܟܐ ܘܡܫܢܝܢܗܘܢ ܒܗ ܕܡܕ̈ܪܝܗܘܢ.
ܡܚܝܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܫ̇ܒܩ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܠܡܫܪܐ ܗܕܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܙܕ̇ܩ ܒܗܡ ܢܘܒܠܝܟ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ.
ܪܚܡ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܗܡ ܒܗ ܒܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܡܫܡܫܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܘܣܬܪܗ ܒܐܪܒܥܝܟ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܢܛܘܪܐ ܠܥܘܠܡ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܬ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܛܠܝܘܗܝ ܕ ܒܢܝܐ ܕܡܒܠܒܠܝܗܝ:
* ܘܡܠܘܗܝ ܒܫܘܒܚܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܠܐܚܝܢ ܚܕ ܚܕܐ ܠܚܪܢܝܢ. * f. 257r
ܐܝܟ ܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܕܒܪ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܗ̣ܘܐ ܢܛܘܪܐ ܠܚܝܘܬ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܐܝܟ ܡܕ̈ܒܪܐ ܕܡܬܠܡ ܒܠܐ ܒܪܟܐ ܒܪ̈ܟܝܢ:
ܕܥܡ ܒܪܝܬܗ ܒܣܬܪܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܠܚܣܝܘܬܗ.
ܐܘ ܐܘܡܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܒܠ ܟܠܡܕܡ:
ܕܢܣܒ ܘܡܠܝܗ ܠܐܘܡܢܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܫܡܝ̈ܬܗ.
ܫܚܡܬ ܘܥܒܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝ̈ܬܗ ܗܡ ܒܥܒܕܢ:
ܗܘ، ܢܥܡܬܗ ܠܥܒܪܘܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܗ ܠܡܕܒܪ ܠܥܒܕܗ.
ܗܝ، ܒܠܬ ܠܐܕܡ ܥܠ ܒܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܪܬܗ̇ ܒܥܠܠܗܐ:
ܗܘ، ܐܘܕܥܬܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܪܝܐ ܡܪܐ ܕܟܠܐ.
ܗܝ، ܐܫܬܪܬܗ ܠܡܟܝܠ ܕܒܢܝܐ ܒܪܝܟܬ ܡܪܝܗ:
ܘܒܠܘ̈ܬܐ ܦܪܒ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܦܟܝܐ ܠܚܣܝܐ.
ܒܗ ܐܬܚܡܢ ܚܝܝܢ ܥܦܪܐ ܕܢܥܦܪ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܘܕܓܦܪ ܫܕܟ ܦܘ، ܒܥܦܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܘ̈ܒܕܬܐ.
ܗܝ، ܒܕܡܬ ܠܗ ܠܠܒܢ̈ܝܟ ܥܠ ܡܠܕܐ ܕܗ̣ܘܐ ܡܚܝܗ:
ܕܡܚܝܫ ܠܐܪܒܐ ܘܡܚܒܪ ܐܟܠܐ ܕܒܪܝܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ.

---

379. ܗܘܐ] om. I (hom.) — 386. ܘܐܝܬ] om. in. ܘ H — 388. ܘܡܫܢܝܢܗܘܢ] add. sey. H — 392. ܘܣܬܪܗ] read ܘܣܬܪܗ̇ as H | ܒܐܪܒܥܝܟ] read (?) ܒܐܪܝܟ -- 403. ܕܡܢ ܪܬܗ̇] read ܕܡܢ ܪܬܗ — 404. ܐܘܕܥܬܗ] ܐܘܕܥܬܗ̇ H

ܗ̇ܝ ܠܒܪܬ ܒܗ ܐܦ ܒܗ ܒܒܪ ܠܒܢܝܟ ܠܒܪܐ ܚܕܬܐ:
ܘܬܪ ܟܠܗ ܦܘܡܗ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܚ̈ܕܬܐ ܕܚܘܕܬ ܐܚܝܐ.
ܠܒܠܒܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܗ̇، ܕܒܥܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ:
ܘܣܒܪܬ ܟܠܗ ܗܘ، ܡܣܒܪܢܐ ܟܠ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܠܚܕܬܐ.
ܡܢ ܚܕܬܘܬܗ ܡܠܦܐ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ ܠܚܕܬܘܬܗܘܢ:
ܗܘ، ܬܘܒ ܒܒܪܐ ܐܦ ܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪܗ.
ܢܘܚ ܛܒ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܗ̇ ܠܒܪܝܬ ܐܪ̈ܙܝܗ̇:
ܗܘ، ܬܘܒ ܡܒܝܠ ܡܢܬ ܡܪܟܒܬܗ ܠܚܝܠܘܬܗ̇.
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܢܘܚܐ ܒܠܬ ܠܗ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ̇:
ܐܦ ܗܘ ܒܢܘܚܐ ܛܒ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ̇ ܕܥܠܡܘܬܗ̇.
ܫܪܪܐ ܛܒ ܠܗ̇ ܪܫܡܐ ܕܩܘܫܬܐ ܠܕܚܠܬ ܩܘܫܬܐ:
ܐܦ ܗܝ، ܒܩܘܫܬܐ ܦܪܥܬܗ ܐ ܒܪܐ ܕܛܒ ܡܢ ܒܚܠܗ.
ܐ ܒܪܐ ܛܒܥܐ ܦܪܥܬܗ ܠܒܐܢܐ ܕܛܠܡ ܒܚܒܗ:
ܘܛܪܬ ܒܗ̇ ܘܡܘܒܗ̇ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܕܢܫܬܬܪܘܢ ܒܗ̇.
ܚܟܡܬܐ ܕܢܘܚܐ ܠܐ ܡܥ̈ܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܐܝܕܘ̈ܗܝ:
ܘܗܒܗ̇ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܕܢܚܘܢ ܒܐܘܒܠܗ̇.
ܐܘܒܠܐ ܕܢܘܚܐ ܐܒܠ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܘܐܘܒܠ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܘܫܡ ܚܝܘܬܗ ܓܘܚ ܒܒܢܝܢ ܘܛܠܠܗ ܒܢ̈ܘܚܐ.
ܢ̈ܘܚܐ ܕܡܢ ܢܘܚ ܕܪܘ ܒܬܪ ܒܢ̈ܝܢ ܡܢ ܢܘܚ ܘܠܒܐ:
ܘܗܘܢ ܕܪܝܢ ܒܪܒܐ ܕܛܠܡ ܪܗܛܗ ܕܪܒܢܐ.
ܡܢ ܫܪܘ ܢܘ̈ܚܐ ܠܒܪܕܐ ܡܢ ܫܪܝܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܡܩܘܡ ܒܩܪܒܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ.
ܫܠܐ ܕܒܪܢ ܓܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܢܘ̈ܚܐ ܘܦܫܪ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܘܒܪ ܥܦܪܬ ܠܗ ܢܘܚ، ܐܢܘܢ ܠܟܝܢ ܟܠ ܘܟܠ.
ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܒܠܬܢ ܛܒܪ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܚܝܘܬܗ:
ܘܒܬܪ ܕܒܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܠ ܒܢܝܗ ܕܒܫܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܢ.
ܒܒܫܡܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘ، ܫܘܒܚܗ ܠ ܕ: ܐܚܣܢܬܢ:
ܘܫܒܝܚܘܬ ܒܪܬ ܠ ܒܢܝܗ ܒܐܝܕ ܠ ܕ: ܟܠ.
ܒܐܝܕ ܫܟܠ ܡܒܪܬܗ ܠ ܕ: ܟܠ[ܘܟܠ]:
ܬܘ ܢܘܕܐ ܠܗ ܠܛܒ ܡܒܝܠ ܕܢܘܚ ܡܒܝܠ܀

---

418. ܬܘܒ] ܛܒ H — 420. ܦܘܪܩܢܗ̇] ܦܘܪܩܢܐ H — 424. ܘܛܪܬ] ܘܛܪܬ H — 430. ܕܪܒܢܐ] ܒܪܒܢܐ I — 434. ܠܟܝܢ] ܠܟܠ H — 439. [ܘܟܠ] om. AI, read as H

Homily IV

On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues

Sigla of Manuscripts

A = London, British Library Oriental 5463
H = Vatican Syriac 588
I = Teheran, Neesan 1

ܕܝܠܗ ܥܕ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܒܥܝܢ ܘܬܪܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܡܓܕܠܐ ܕܒܒܠ ܘܥܠ ܦܘܠܓ ܠܫ̈ܢܐ.

* f. 257v

ܐܬܐ ܕܫܝܢܐ * ܝܗܒ ܒܪܘܝܐ ܠܟܝܢ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܪܗܒܘܢ ܡܢ ܛܘܦܢܐ ܕܢܚܒܠ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܩܝܡܐ ܕܚܘܣܐ ܐܚܝܕ ܒܚܘܒܗܘܢ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܣܪܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܪܓܙ ܘܪܕܪܐ ܒܡܝ̈ܐ ܠܡܚܪܒܘܬܗܘܢ.
ܒܐܬܐ ܕܩܫܬܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟܢ ܪܡܙܬ ܚܘܒܗ:
ܕܒܗ̇ ܪܫܡ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܟܝܢܗ ܘܣܡܗ ܠܩܝܡܐ.
ܐܬܐ ܕܩܫܬܐ ܢܓܕ ܒܥܢ̈ܢܐ ܩܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܘܢ:
ܕܢܚܘܪܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܘܢܬܢܝܚܘܢ ܠܡܒܘܠܐ ܕܢܚܠ ܐܝܟܢ.
ܒܩܫܬܐ ܓܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܚܬܗ ܘܒܫܘܫܒܬܗ:
ܕܗܘܝܘ ܪܕܪܐ ܘܗܘܝܘ ܕܩܢܝܐ ܣܒܝܟܐܝܬ.
ܩܫܬܐ ܒܦܫܝܛܬܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟܢ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ̇ ܡܬܪܐ:
ܕܢܠܦ ܐܝܟܢ ܕܠܐ ܫܕܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܓܐܪ̈ܐ ܕܡܚ̈ܢܐ.
ܟܠܒ̇ ܐܝܕܐ ܘܟܠܒ̇ ܡܬܪܐ ܢܘܚܗ̇ ܠܩܫܬܐ:
ܕܢܘܕܥ ܐܝܟܢ ܕܠܐ ܪܓܝܓ ܠܡܚܒܠܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܐ ܠܡܚܒܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܐܐܪ ܘܐܘܪܒ ܚܘܒܗ̇:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܩܝܡܐ ܘܫܝܢܐ ܒܪܚܡ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܩܝܡܐ ܘܫܝܢܐ ܩܒܥ ܒܥܢ̈ܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܚܘܝܢܬܐ:
ܕܢܚܘܪܘܢ ܒܗ ܘܢܬܢܝܚܘܢ ܚܘܠܐ ܘܢܬܟܒܫܘܢ ܫܘܟܐ.
ܚܬܐ ܕܕܡܐ ܘܗܘܪܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܢܓܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ̇:
ܕܡܒܕܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܒܗܬܐ ܠܚܝܒܐ ܥܠ ܚܘ̈ܒܐ.
ܥܢܢܐ ܘܢܗ̈ܪܐ ܘܚܝܠ ܐܬܘܬܗ ܒܩܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܘܒܗ̇:
ܕܠܦܘܬ ܩܫܬܐ ܐܦ ܐܝܕܗ̇ ܘܓܐܪ̈ܐ ܕܪܘ ܠܗ̇.
ܐܝܟ ܕܥܡ ܒܥܠܐ ܡܚܘܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܐܬܐ ܡܫܝܚܬܐ:
ܕܗܕܐ ܕܐܚܝܕܬ ܒܕܪܒ ܪܡܙܐ ܒܫܡ ܛܘܦܢܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܡܬܚܫܚ ܪܡܙܐ ܕܡܢ ܚܢܢ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܡܬܪܐ:
ܘܡܕܝܢܬ̇ ܘܚܝܠܬ̇ ܠܡܩܛܠ ܒܥܠܡܐ ܛܘܦܢܐ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ.

Title. ܕܫܒܥܝܢ ܘܬܪܝܢ] ܕܥܒ H — 18. ܒܗ] read ܒܗ̇ as H

ܗܕܐ ܠܥܒܕܬ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܒܢܝܢ ܒܢܝܢܫܐ:
ܘܫܪܝܬ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܪ̈ܗܡܟܐ ܒܫܡܝ، ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܚܝ ܕܬܗ̇ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܫܐ ܡܠܝܬ ܡܪܐ:
ܘܡܥܡܪ̈ܢܐ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܒ̈ܠܠܐ ܘܫܡܠܝܘ ܒܢܝܢ.
ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܚܝ ܕܒܬ ܒܝܬ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܐܦ ܚܘܝ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܒܪܒܬ ܐܢܐ ܒܪ̈ܐ ܕܡܒܪܐ ܡܬܚܠܚܠܢܐ.
ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܫܒܩܬ ܐܦ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܒܝܬ ܢܘܚ ܦܪܫܬ:
ܘܐܣܒܬ ܒܝܬ ܢܘܚ ܒܢܝܫܐ ܣܓܝܐ ܠܦܘܠܓ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܢܛܪܬ ܒܡܫܩܠܐ ܡܢ̈ܬܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܒܠܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܛܠܒܘ ܒܗܬ ܡܫܬܘܠܐ ܘܒ̈ܠܠܐ ܪ̈ܗܡܟܐ.
ܒܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܝܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܡܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܒܠܩ̈ܐ ܡܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܠܒܢܝܢ ܥܢܝܐ.
ܠܥܢܝܐ ܢܟܪܗ ܒܢܝܢ ܒܫܢܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢ̈ܠܐ:
ܘܐܦܩܗ̇ ܡܕܡ ܒܒܝܢ ܒܬ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܚܢܐ.
ܗܐ ܐܦܩܬܗ ܠܠܒܢܝܢ ܥܢܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝܬ:
ܚܘ ܠܐ ܬܒܣܪܘܢ ܥܠ ܦܘܩܕܢ̈ܝ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ.
ܗܐ ܚܙܝܬܘܢ ܡܥܒܕܬ ܢܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܕܒܠܒܘܢ ܒܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܦܘܫܘ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܬܢܟܪܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܒ̈ܠܠܐ.
ܗܐ ܐܠܦܬܟܘܢ ܕܢ̈ܝܐ ܒܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܫܡ ܠܒܢܝܬܐ:
ܚܘ ܐܬܕܟܪܘ ܣܝܥܬܗ ܒܝܬ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ.
ܗܐ ܐܫܡܥܬ ܡܢܟܐ ܕܫܢܝܐ ܒܥܬ ܠܗ ܘܠܟܘܢ:
ܠܐ ܬܫܪܘܢܗ̇ ܒܦܘܫ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܗܦܟܢ ܐܢ ܠܟ.
ܗܐ ܚܘ ܡܫܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܡܢܐ ܠܗ ܒܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܚܐ:
ܘܠܝܬ ܒܗ̇ ܡܬܪܐ ܐܦܠܐ ܐܢܕܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܐ ܠܗ̇.
ܚܙܘ ܘܐܬܒܩܘ ܕܠܝܬ ܡܐܪܥܐ ܢܫܝܢܐ ܡܫܬܐ:
ܘܐܢܐ ܗܐ ܚܒܪ̈ܬܗ ܐܬܐ ܕܥܢܝܐ * ܒܥܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܢܫ̈ܐ.
ܠܥܢܝܐ ܪ ܒܥܝܬ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܡܪ̈ܟܐ ܕܒܢ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܛܠܠܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܪܚܝܩܬ ܡܬܪܐ ܒܡܫܬܐ ܕܣܘܚܬ.
ܗܐ ܚܙܝܬܘܢ ܪ ܒܬ ܒܢܝܢ ܕܪܫܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘ:
ܠܐ ܬܚܡ ܘܚܙܝ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܢ ܠܡܫܒܪ ܪܘ ܒܪܐ.
ܫܒܥܐ ܘܐܪܒܥܐ ܢܘܗܘ ܗܕܐ ܒܥܬ ܠܗ ܘܠܟܘܢ:
ܕܠܐ ܪ ܒܥܐ ܠܗ ܠܡܛܠܠ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܠܘܬܐ.

* f. 258r

---

31. ܕܚܝ ܕܒܬ] ܬ ܕܚܝ I — 33. ܫܘܒܚܐ] read ܫܪܒܐ as H (cf. 65) — 38. ܕܒܠܩ̈ܐ] ܕܒܠܩܐ H | ܠܗ] read ܠܗ̇ — 39. ܢܟܪܗ] read ܢܟܪܗ̇ as H — 41. ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝܬ] corr. from ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝ H — 46. ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ] add. sey. H — 52. ܚܒܪ̈ܬܗ] ܚܒܪܬܗ H

ܗܠܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܒܫܡܐ ܒܒܫܡܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܦܬܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܕܘܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܬܐ ܕܡܫܬܐ.
ܒܗܘ ܐܬܒܢܝ ܢܘܚ ܗܘ ܘܒܢܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܒܫܦܪܐ:
ܘܒܬܪ ܕܒܢܐ ܛܘܒ ܡܠܬܗ ܒܬܪ ܛܘܒܝܢ.
ܒܒܠܐ ܕܒܢܐ ܦܘ، ܥܢܝܐ ܪ ܒܗ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ:
ܘܒܬܪ ܡܠܝܠ ܓܠ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܘܐܬܠܝܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ.
ܦܠܓܐ ܫܪܒܐ ܕܦܠܓ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܪ ܒܗ ܣܡܠܗ:
ܘܫܪܝ، ܪܕܝܐ ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܬܫܥܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ.
ܫܒܩܘ ܢܬܘܬܐ ܕܦܘܩܕ ܕܥܢܝܐ ܕܡܠܠܘ ܡܢ ܢܘܚ:
ܘܛܒܘ ܐܬܬܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܒܬ ܠܗ ܘܠܗܘܢ.
ܢܦܩܘ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܘܫܒܩܘܬܐ ܕܐܝ ܪ ܡܫܬܐ:
ܘܫܪܘ ܦܣܝܢ ܠܡܓܒܘ ܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܚܙܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܢܦܩܘ ܠܠܒܢܝܢ ܥܢܝܐ:
ܘܬܪܝܢ ܘܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܠܒܒܠ ܥܡ ܒܘܠܒܠܐ.
ܚܙܘ ܡܢ ܥܢܝܐ ܕܥܡ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܕܒܬܪ ܣܘܒܗ:
ܘܢܦܩܘ ܒܒܝܢ ܢܬܘܬ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܡܫܒܝܢ ܒܘܒܗ̇.
ܒܪ ܒܬ ܐܪܥܐ ܢܦܩܘ ܐܪ̈ܥܢܐ ܡܢ ܪ ܒܗ ܥܢܝܐ:
ܠܡܐܝܢ ܢܘ̈ܟܪܐ ܒܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܛܒ̈ܢܝ ܘܦܐܝܢ.
ܫܘܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܒܪ ܪܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܒܒܠ:
ܘܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܒܢܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܥܢܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ.
ܚܕ ܪ ܒܢܝܐ ܕܪܒ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܕܡܝܐ ܠܒܒܠ:
ܘܒܢܘ ܒܒܠ ܪ ܒܗ ܗܘܘ ܪ ܒܬܐ ܕܒܒܠܐ ܘܒܘܠܐ.
ܪ ܒܬܐ ܗܢܝܬܐ ܪ ܒܗ ܡܪ̈ܕܝܐ ܡܪܕܝܐܝܬ:
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܐܕܡ ܕܪ ܒܝ ܘܐܬܡܢ ܠܦܐܪܐ ܘܕܪ ܒܟܐ.
ܘܗܬܪܐ ܗܒܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܗ، ܕܐܕܡ:
ܘܒܗ، ܛܘܒܝܢ ܠܗ ܐܦ ܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܒܘܗܘܢ.
ܘܗ̇ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܐܕܡ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ، ܠܡܣܠܩ ܕܪ ܒܗ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܒܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܐܕܡ ܪܕܘ ܐܦ ܝܠܕ̈ܘܗܝ، ܡܪܚܐܝܬ:
ܘܡܕܪܐ ܕܒܘܠܐ ܒܒܗ ܕܢܫܒܚܘܢ ܥܠ ܒܪܘܟܐ.
ܥܠ ܒܒܘܕܐ ܡܪܕܘ ܒܦ̈ܪܟܐ ܒܕܝ̈ ܕܚܝܘܬܐ:
ܘܫܬܕܘ ܪܝܫܐ ܠܡܬܒܬܫܘ ܒܝܬ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܗܘܢ.

---

60. ܘܦܬܒ] ܘܐܬܦܬܒ H — 67. ܕܥܢܝܐ] read ܥܢܝܐ as HI — 80. ܪ ܒܗ ܗܘܘ] in marg. A, ܐܘܟܝܢ H

ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܘܠܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܒ̈ܒܠܐ ܒܒܠܐܝܬ:
ܘܥܒܪܘ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܫܢܐ ܕܫܘܬܦܐ ܠܘܡܠ ܘܥܒܕܬܐ.
ܫܘܬܦܐ ܫܒܠܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܫܒ̈ܠܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܐܝܟܢܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܒܕܘܗܝ ܒܪܫ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܗܘܢ.
ܙܒܢܐ ܘܒܙܒܢܐ ܗܒܪܘ ܕܡܚܒܒܝܢ ܦܠܓܘܬ ܐܚܝ̈ܗܘܢ:
ܘܫܠܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܪܐ ܠܟܠ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ.
ܗܕܘܡܐܝܬ ܢܦܠܬ ܗܕ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܫܪܘ ܥܦܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܫܘܒ̈ܚܝܗܘܢ.
ܕܠܐ ܒܡܕܡ ܫܘܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܥܒܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܒܗܘ ܕܢܦܪܘܢ ܒܒܢܝܢ ܒܒܠܐ.
ܡܟܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ ܪܓܬܐ ܕܕܠܘܬ ܒܚܘܫܒ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܢ ܐܬܪܒܘ ܕܢܦܚܘܢ ܒܒܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܡܫܘܚܬܐ.
ܠܟܡ ܒܗ ܐܬܪܡܒܘ ܕ̈ܚܝܠܘܗܝ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܡܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܫܘܐ ܒܡܪܘܚܐ ܕܒܫܡܝܐ ܡܢ ܡܢ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܪܓܬܐ ܒܫܒܬܐ ܥܒܘܕܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܒܠܠܬ̈ ܠܫܢܐ:
ܘܒܐܠܗܘܬ ܒܗ ܕܢܪܡܘܢ ܟܐܦܐ ܠܪܘܡܐ.
ܣܓܝ ܐܪܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܥܒܬܐ:
* f. 258v
ܘܥܒܪܘ ܗܪ ܠܟܡ * ܫܘܥܒ̈ܕܝܗܘܢ ܒܕܠܐ ܦܐܝܡ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܒܥܒܬܐ ܦܠܓܘ ܪ̈ܟܒܝܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܘܠܥܬܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܒܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܡܛܘ ܘܐܬܦܠܓܘ ܠܦܠܓܝܢ ܐܪܒܥ.
ܥܡܡܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܡܠܐ ܫܢ̈ܐ:
ܘܐܪܡܝܘ ܒܒܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܪܢܐ ܠܦܓܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ.
ܥܠܘ ܡܘܗ̈ܒܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܪܝܐ:
ܘܕ ܠܒܠܗ̇ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܡܠܝܬ ܥܡܡܐ ܕܢܘܝ ܐܢܘܢ.
ܪܘܚ ܕܡܕܡ ܟܠ ܘܠܐ ܡܚܝܕ ܡܠܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝ:
ܘܗܦܟ ܡܚܝܬܐ ܡܢ̈ܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܠܐ ܘܡܚܝܠ ܠܝ.
ܠܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܣܥܡܘܗܝ ܫܒ̈ܠܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ:
ܘܥܠܗ̇ܝ ܫܪܘ ܠܡܒܢܐ ܡܢܕܪܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܘܢܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ, ܥܠܡܗ ܠܫܪܕܐ ܫܬ̈ܝ, ܠܟܐ:
ܘܐܪܡܝܘ ܒܒܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܦܠܘ ܗܘܐ ܠܘܬ ܥܘܠܡܐ.
ܗܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܐܠܗܘ ܫܒ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܡܢܝܐ:
ܕܢܒܢܘܢ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܦܩܘܢ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܡܚܒܘܠܐ.

---

96. ܗܘܘ] in marg. A, ܡܫܡܝܢ H — 98. ܫܪܘ] ܫܪ I — 99. ܕܥܒܕܝܢ] corr. from ܕܥܒܪܝܢ A, ܕܥܒܪܝܢ HI — 118. ܘܥܠܗ̇ܝ] om. in. ܘ H

ܒܗܢ ܪܒܝܢܐ ܐܙܕܗܪܘ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢܝܢܐ:
ܕܢܗܕܪܘܢ ܡܐܪܒܐ ܡܢ ܒܒܘܕܐ ܟܐܦ̈ܐ ܪܘܡܐ.
ܬܠܬ ܐܬܦܫܟܘ ܟܠܢ̈ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܛܒ ܦܓ̈ܪܗܘܢ:
ܘܒܠܬܗܝܢ ܒܬܕܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܕܡ ܐܚܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܚܙܐ ܕܢܬܦܩܘܢ ܡܢ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܕܠܝܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ:
ܘܚܙܐ ܕܢܐܚܕܘܢ ܕܙܪܐ ܒܪܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܘܢܐ.
ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܠܬ ܕܡܢܐ ܕܐܬܒܫܡܘ ܘܐܒܗ ܘܐܡܠܟ:
ܢܦܩܘܢ ܡܐܪܒܐ ܥܡ ܥܒܘܗܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܟܠ ܐܘܡܬܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܣܢܩܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܕܟܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܡܚܝܒ ܫܒܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܟܘܬܗܘܢ.
ܪܟܒܘ ܘܐܬܦܫܟܘ ܠܡܕܒܪܐ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܦܩܘܗܝ ܠܟܠܢܐ ܠܢܒܠܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܕܪ̈ܚܝܫܝܗܘܢ.
ܬܘ ܠܢ ܢܡܪܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܡܕܪܐ ܘܢܘܡܪ ܐܚܝܢ:
ܘܢܒܢܐ ܡܓܕܠܐ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܪܝܫܗ ܠܪܘܡܐ ܕܠܥܠ.
ܬܘ ܢܬܟܬܫ ܥܡ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܘܦܘܡܝ, ܫܢ̈ܝ: […]
ܬܘ ܢܥܒܕ ܠܢ ܫܡܐ ܒܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܛܒ ܡܢ ܟܠܢ:
ܕܢܬܘܢܘܗ̇ ܕܪ̈ܐ ܕܐܬܝܢ ܠܒܬܪ ܚܠܦ.
ܬܘ ܢܬܠ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܟܠ ܬܟܬܘܫܐ ܕܥܡ ܒܥܠܕܪܐ:
ܘܢܥܒܕ ܒܗܘ ܡܐܪܒܐ ܕܢܝܠܐ ܟܐܦ̈ܐ ܪܘܡܐ.
ܬܘ ܢܩܝܡ ܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܡܬ̈ܚܙܝܢܐ:
ܘܢܫܪܐ ܠܟܪ̈ܐ ܒܐܠܗ ܟܠܗ ܕܢܚܠ ܠܒܢܝܢ.
ܬܘ ܢܬܢܣܩ ܒܢܬܪܐ ܕܕܡܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܕܢܒܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܡܕ̈ܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܫܢܐ.
ܬܘ ܢܥܒܕ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܦܩܕ ܒܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܟܠ:
ܘܢܬܟܒ ܒܐܝܕ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܡܢܐ ܕܒܢܝܢ ܕܐܥܒܕܗ ܡܓܠ.
ܬܘ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܢܐ ܕܕܒܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢܝܢܐ:
ܕܟܠ ܦܢ ܢܒܠܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܘܬܐ.
ܒܕܝܢܐ ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܦܪܚ ܒܒܗ ܠܒܪܐܝܬ:
ܘܢܫܒ ܕܪ ܟܗ ܘܢܥܡ ܥܘܠܦܗ ܘܢܗܘܐ ܕܝܠܢ.
ܢܡܪܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܢܘܡܪ ܐܚܝܢ ܒܥܠܡܬܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܬܪܡ ܡܢܐ ܕܡܬܢܫܒܝܢ ܡܢ̈ܝܐ ܒܠܒܗܘܢ.
ܢܒܢܐ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܢܒܒܘܫ ܢܒܠܘܗܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܘܚܝܠܐ:

---

126. ܒܗ] ܠܗ H — 129. ܘܐܡܠܟ] read ܘܐܡܠܟܘ as H — 131. ܣܢܩܐ] add. sey. I — 137. ܘܦܘܡܝ,] ܕܦܘܡܝ, H | om. 1(?) stich AHI

ܕܢܗܘܐ ܫܦܩ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܕܡܬܠܒܟ ܠܝ.
ܢܦܠܐ ܐܣܟܡܗ، ܘܢܘܪܒ ܐܢܫ ܠܦܘܬ ܪܒܘܬܗ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܒܨܘܢ، ܐ̈ܠܠܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܫܬ̈ܒܚܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ.
ܢܥܪ ܢܟܝܢܘܗ، ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܝ:
ܕܠܐ ܬܬ ܠܒܢܐ ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܒܬܪ ܘܟܢܐ.
ܒܢ̈ܝ ܦܐ ܥܠ̈ܝܬܐ ܢܒܢܘܢܗ، ܟܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܐ̈ܦܐ:
* ܘܣܠܩ ܠܫܢܐ ܢܗܪܐ ܣܠܥܐ ܒܝܬ ܥܩܪ̈ܘܗܝ، * f. 259r
ܣܠܥܐ ܘܣܝ̈ ܦܐ ܢܣܠܩ ܐܒܢܐ: ܒܒܢܝܢ ܒܒܠ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܒܨܘܢ، ܫܘܠܦ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܘܫܘܡܐ.
ܘܒܡ ܒܢܝܢ ܢܥܪ ܐܒܕ: ܐܦ ܪܚܝܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܢܬܪܦܐ ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܐ ܕܢܩܪܒ ܒܗܝܢ.
ܚܘ ܠܐ ܢܗܡܐ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܒܪܗ ܒܕ݂ ܡܐܪܫܐ:
ܕܠܒܐ ܢܒܕܪ ܒܐܪܒܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܡܥܠܝܢ.
ܐܝܟ ܠܫܬܝܐ ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܦܪܫܘ ܘܐܬܒܢܝܘ:
ܘܦܕܢܘ ܚܕܡܘ ܒܠ ܒܡܕܝܢܬܗ ܕܒܬܪ ܘܟܢܐ.
ܐܘ ܠܡܥܒܕܐ ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܚܙܝ ܚܘ ܬܡܝܗܘܬ:
ܘܚܪܘ ܘܐܬܒܝܢܘ ܒܗ̇، ܕܒܬܪ̈ܐ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܘܬ.
ܐܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܗܘܘ ܒܚܕ. ܚܫܒܐ ܒܒܢܝܢ ܒܒܠܐ:
ܕܐܪܒܥܘ ܐܢܕܐ ܒܠܐ ܫܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܗܘܢ ܐܒܕܘ ܒܕܠܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܒܠ ܚܘܒܬܗܘܢ:
ܘܟܠܗ ܘܚܘܝܘ ܒܠ ܫܘܢܝܗܘܢ ܕܠܒܠ ܦܢ̈ܝܢ.
ܐܪܡܝܘ ܐܝܕܐ ܘܒܬܒܘ ܘܫܠܡܘ ܕܐ ܡܬܒܕܪܝܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܒܢܝܘ ܒܒܢܝܢ ܕܢܩܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܚ ܦܘܡܗܘܢ.
ܒܬܒܘ ܡܘܦܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܡܚܣܢܐ ܥܘܪܐ ܕܠܫܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܫܘ ܘܐܗܡܝܘ ܡܢ ܚܫܒܐ ܫܒܠܐ ܕܐܘܠܘ.
ܒܒܗܘ ܘܫܦܪܘ ܘܫܡܘ ܥܠܐܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܒܠܡ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܕܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܩܪܒ ܘܟܢܐ ܕܡܫܬܚܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܥܒܕܘ ܡܬܒܕܐ ܘܐܘܩܕܘ ܣܠܥܐ ܘܥܪܝܘ ܒܢܝܢ:
ܘܒܡ ܒܢܝܢܗܘܢ ܡܬܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܫܥܒ̈ܕܝܗܘܢ.
ܒܒܟܐ ܕܒܢܝܢܐ ܡܬܒܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܦ̈ܝ ܪܘܡܐ:
ܠܒܗܘܢ ܢܛܪ ܡܬܒܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܫܬܐܪܬܐ.
ܒܒܟܐ ܕܢܘܡ ܡܢ ܢܘܡ ܡܬܬܘܣܦ ܗܘܐ ܒܠ ܡܫܘܚܬܗ:

---

161. ܣܠܥܐ] add. sey. H — 162. ܣܠܥܐ] add. sey. H — 171. ܘܗ̇] ܗ̇، H — 172. ܒܚܕ] ܒܚܕ. H — 182. ܣܠܥܐ] add. sey. H

ܒܒܠܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܡܬܪܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ.
ܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܗܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܕܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܠ ܐܢܚܢܢ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܐ ܪ ܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܢܚܢ ܠܐܝܢ.
ܚܦܝܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܒ ܕܐܡܪܬ، ܬܫܡ ܠܪܥ ܪ ܒܬܪܗܘܢ:
ܘܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܐܡܪܬ، ܢܚܘ ܫܘܠܡ ܒܒܠܐ.
ܠܐ ܫܒܩܐ ܗܘܬ ܪ ܒܬܪܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܕܠܡܒܢܝܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܗܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܪ̈ ܒܪܟܐ ܘܪ̈ܓܠܐ ܡܢ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ.
ܢܚܐ ܒܒܢܕܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܚܙܐ ܠܗ ܒܒܠܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ:
ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܢ ܒܢܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܠܛܝܢ ܚܝܠܝܢ.
ܢܚܐ ܕܐ ܒܢܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܫܒܚܘ:
ܘܢܫܩܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܫܘܢ ܒܒܒܠܐ ܘܒܒܠܐ.
ܢܦܩ ܘܐܬܪܚܡ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܡܒܕ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ:
ܘܥܪ، ܡܬܪ ܠܒܡ ܩܠܐ ܕܚܘܒܐ ܘܕܠܘܚܡܐ.
ܚܘܒܐ ܟܪܝܟ ܒܬܪ ܕܢܚܐ ܕܒܠ ܡܪ̈ܚܐ:
ܘܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܠܪܗ ܠܒܐܒܐ ܕܐܒܢܝܢܘܢ.
ܡܢܫ ܠܒܪ ܢܦܩ ܒܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܒܠܐ ܕܕܠܐ ܒܡܝ:
ܘܒܐܫܒܝܢ ܚܒܬܐ ܐܢܝܫ ܐܢܘ ܡܢ ܠܘܦܝܐ.
ܐܫܒܚܐ ܕܪܘ ܠܟܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ ܕܐܫܒܚ ܐܢܘ:
ܘܠܒܘ ܡܢܗ ܒܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܒܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܒܠܠ.
ܡܠܐ ܠܟܠܢܐ ܐܫܒܚ ܡܫܥܠ ܠܗ ܡܢܐ ܡܠܐ:
ܕܡܬܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܘܕܒܡܗ ܡܢ ܕܠܚܘܒܬ.
ܒܒܢ̈ܝ ܡܠܒܗ ܡܬܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܢܕܒ ܒܠܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܒܕܪܐ ܦܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚܘܒܬ ܒܒܗ.
ܗܐ ܠܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘܘ ܚܕ ܒܒܐ ܘܚܕ ܠܥܢܐ:
ܘܒܢܫܐ ܐܒܚܕ ܠܡܬܒܬܫܘ ܠܗܘܒܠ * ܡܢ ܒܢܝ. * f. 259v
ܗܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܕܡ ܗܫܐ ܒܠ ܡܪܘܬ، ܐܝܟ ܐܒܗܘܗܝ:
ܘܒܢܝܢ ܠܡܫܡ ܠܪܝ ܠܟ ܪܘܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ.
ܗܐ ܡܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܫܠܘ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܐ ܕܚܘܒ ܡܢ̈ܐ:
ܘܒܢܘ ܫܩܝܐ ܕܢܫܬܬܪܘ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܠܘܦܢܐ.
ܗܐ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ ܚܬܕܘ ܐܘܢܐ ܘܡܠܦܘ ܐܪܙܐ:
ܕܢܫܘ ܢܗܘܘ ܗܪܬܐ ܒܘܪܒܢܐ ܒܝܬ ܠܗ ܘܠܗܘܢ.
ܗܐ ܗܒܘ ܬܒܘ، ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܠܓܘܢ ܚܕ ܒܠ ܚܒܪܗ:

---

189. ܠܐܝܢ] before corr. prec. by ܠܐ (dit.) — 203. ܠܘܦܝܐ] del. and add. again in marg. — 214. before corr. stich repeated (dit.) H

ܒܕܡܐ ܕܕܚܝܢ ܘܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܪܘܡܐ ܘܥܘܡܩܐ.
ܗܐ ܐܬܒܢܝܘ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܢܝܢ ܟܠ ܒܕܘܪܗܘܢ:
ܘܪܕܘ ܕܬܫܠܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܠܠ ܒܪ ܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܬܘ ܠܡ ܢܚܘܬ ܢܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܒܪܗ:
ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܘܠܒܢܐ ܕܠܫܢܝܗܘܢ.
ܬܘ ܢܪܡܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܡܪܬܐ ܒܫܬܩܐ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܪ ܒܠܫܢ:
ܘܢܣܠܘܒ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܫܦܝܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܣܬܪܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܬܘ ܫܘܐܬ ܢܚܘܬ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܢܝܐ:
ܘܢܚܒܪ ܡܐܪܘܬܐ ܒܗܢ ܒܫܪ̈ܒܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ.
ܬܘ ܢܬܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܒܪܐ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܟܠ ܠܫܢ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܗܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܘܟܘܠ ܡܐܪܘܬܐ ܕܢܘܫܒ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܬܘ ܢܡܚܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܡܚܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܦܣܩܝܢ ܒܗ:
ܘܢܚܙܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܐܒܗܘܪܐ ܕܐܬܘܪ̈ܬܐ.
ܐܘܢ ܒܪܘܝܐ ܡܢܘ ܗܢܐ ܕܡܬܪ ܠܡ ܐܢܬ:
ܕܚܙܬܟ ܩܠܐ ܕܡܫܬܡܥ ܪܒܟ ܥܠ ܐܢܫܘܬܟ.
ܠܟ ܦܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܡܚܬ ܒܟ ܠܚܢܬ ܐܬܪ̈ܒܐ:
ܘܠܟ ܟܢܟܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܪܕܐ ܠܬܘܣܦܬܟ.
ܒܟ ܡܬܡܠܟܝܢ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܟ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܟ ܬܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܬܘ ܒܟ ܢܚܘܬ ܢܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ.
ܡܢܘ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܡܠܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܕܒܪܝܬ:
ܘܠܟ ܒܕܡܬ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܟ.
ܡܢܘ ܒܪܝܟ ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܡܢܘ ܫܠܛܟ ܕܬܬܠ ܚܝܠܐ ܒܒܪ ܐܢܫ̈ܝܟ.
ܠܡܢܘ ܡܫܬܥܘܩ ܡܢܬ ܐܘ ܦܪܟܬ ܠܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܒܟ:
ܘܠܟ ܐܫܡܥܬ ܠܡܦܩܘ ܕܢܚܐ ܐܡܝܟ ܒܡܣܪܝܟ.
ܕܒܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܝܟ ܠܗܘ ܡܕܡܚܐ ܕܡܘܡܐ ܕܫܘܬܐ:
ܟܕ ܢܓܪ ܗܘܬ ܟ ܠܡܗ ܕܐܕܡ ܡܢ ܒܒܐ ܕܕܪ̈ܝܢ.
ܬܡܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܫܡܥܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܕܒܐ ܠܗܢܐ:
ܗܝ ܕܬܘ ܢܚܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܡܝܟ ܒܕܡܘܬܢ.
ܚܕ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܘܚܕ ܦܘܚܠܐ ܕܗܝ ܘܕܗܘܐ:
ܠܗܠ ܬܘ ܢܚܒܪ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܢܚܘܬ ܕܢܚܐ ܘܢܫܪܐ.
ܚܕ ܗܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܐܒܕܪ ܐܢܫ ܠܗ̇ ܘܠܗܕܐ:

---

245. ܡܢ ܒܒܐ] ܡܢ ܒܒܗ HI — 247. ܐܡܝܟ] ܐܝܟ H

ܘܚܕ ܗܘ ܒܢܝܐ ܕܬܘܡ ܬܡܢ ܘܦܠܓ ܗܪܟܐ.
ܠܒܪ ܡܠܟܗ ܦܪܐ ܒܗ̇ ܕܢܚܘܬ ܘܒܗ̇ ܕܢܒܢܐ:
ܘܗܢܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܒܢܘ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܦܠܓܘ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܕܦܪܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܒܬܘܟ ܐܕܡ:
ܘܠܗܘܢ ܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܡܠܐ ܕܒܪܘ.
ܒܬܘܟ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܦܘܠܓ ܐܢܫܐ ܟ ܒܗ ܒܪܘܚܐ:
ܕܢܚܠܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܒܫܡܝܢ ܒܟܗܘܢ.
ܟܠܢܐ ܗܝ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܡܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܪܒ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܗܐ ܒܫܢܬܐ ܕܒܫܢ̈ܝ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܒܗ ܡܬ ܟܠܢܝ.
ܘܐܠܐ ܢܡܟܐ ܕܡܟܐ ܗܘ ܟܠܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܬܘ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ:
ܕܒܬܘܟܢ ܘܒܦܘܠܓܗ ܪܫܡܐ ܒܠܫܢ.
* f. 260r ܐܢ ܠܘ ܠܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܦܪܐ * ܒܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ:
ܡܢܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܘܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܡܠܟܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܠܫܡܝܐ ܠܐ ܦܐܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܗܝ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ:
ܕܬܘ ܒܟ ܢܚܒܪ ܘܬܘ ܒܟ ܢܚܘܬ ܐܡܝܟ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܗܝ.
ܐܠܘ ܐܡܪ ܕܙܠܘ ܚܬܘ ܦܠܓܘ ܠܟ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܒܪܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܠܒܘܫܐ ܦܪܐ ܐܦ ܓܒܪ.
ܕܠܐ ܚܙܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܚܙܝܗ ܗܝ ܕܬܘ ܢܚܘܬ:
ܕܠܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܗܘܬ.
ܠܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܦܐܫܐ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܘܐܦ ܦܘܠܓܐ:
ܘܒܗܘܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܒܪܐ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܘܦܠܓܗ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ.
ܗܢܘܢ ܬܩܢܘ ܘܗܢܘܢ ܦܠܓܘ ܚܒܝܒܐܝܬ:
ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܚܝܢܐ ܫܘܝܐ.
ܗܢܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܢܚܬܘ ܗܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܢܝܐ:
ܕܢܦܠܓܘܢ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܘܢܬܠܘܢ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܠܟ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܦܘܠܓ ܐܢܫܐ ܪܫܡܘܗܝ ܠܐܪܙܐ ܕܡܢܚܬܗܘܢ:
ܘܦܫܩܗܝ ܠܫܪܬܐ ܟܕ ܡܗܡܢܬܐ ܕܟܠܝܬܐ.
ܡܢܘ ܠܚܕܐ ܠܘܬ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܘܡܢ ܚܕ ܦܘܠܓܐ:
ܕܐܠܦ ܟܠܢܫ ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ.
ܢܚܬܘ ܕܢܦܠܓܘܢ ܠܘ ܡܢܫܬܐ ܕܟܫܝܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܒܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܡܠܠܘܬܗ.
ܢܗܪܐ ܓܪܪ ܐܡܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܪܐ ܟ ܟܕ ܡܢܗܪܐ:

---

257. ܕܒܫܡܝܢ] add. sey. H — 260. ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ] ܕܐܡܪܢ H — 262. ܒܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ] add. sey. H

ܘܡܟܐ ܡܫܬܠܡ ܘܐܙܠ ܐܢܘܢ – ܠܡܠܟ̈ܘ ܣܘܬܪܝܐ.
ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܣܒܬ ܘܫܩܠ ܡܢܗܘܢ – ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ:
ܘܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ – ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
ܒܚܘܦܐ ܡܫܢܐ ܦܫܘܗ ܠܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ –:
ܘܦܬܚ ܒܗܘܢ – ܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܡܫܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܢܚܐ.
ܒܥܠ ܡܕܢܚܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܐܢܘܢ – ܕܗܘ ܩܕܡ ܟܠ:
ܘܒܗܘܢ ܬܘܒ ܕܬܩܢ ܕܢܘܕܥ ܐܢܘܢ – ܕܫܠܝܛ ܟܠ ܟܠ.
ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܐܦܪܫ ܒܝܢܬܗܘܢ – ܐܝܟ ܪ ܒܘܬܗܘܢ –:
ܘܣܠܩ ܦܓܪܐ ܒܗ ܚܘܣܢܐ ܓܒܪ ܬܚܡܘܬܐ.
ܐܘܡܢܐܝܬ ܐܚܕ ܕܪܐ ܒܗ ܘܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ –:
ܘܒܕܪ ܐܢܘܢ – ܒܫܘ̈ܠܐ ܡܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ –.
ܬܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܦܠܓܐ ܕܒܒܠ ܒܫܡܐ ܒܗ ܐܪ̈ܥܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܕܢܬܢܐ ܬܗܪܗ ܒܒܟܐ ܐ – ܢܬܢܐ.
ܡܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ، ܦܫܦܫܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܒܐܝܕܗ:
ܘܢܦܩ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܣܠܩ ܗܕ̈ܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܦܫ ܦܓܪܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܒܗ ܓܠ ܙܒܢܐ ܒܫܢܐ ܠܫܘܥܒܕ̈ܗܘܢ –:
ܘܫܠܝ ܫܠܡ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ – ܘܠܐ ܐܪ ܒܥܐ ܒܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܣܢܝܦܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܦܘܡܗܘܢ – ܡܢܬ ܣܠܩܐ:
ܘܓܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ – ܠܬܒܘܟܐ ܘܦܐܩܐ ܚܕ ܠܗܡܠ ܚܕ.
ܐܝܟ ܒܢܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܚܘܬܐ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܡܕܢܚܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܕܪ̈ܐ ܢܟ̈ܠܐ ܒܬܦܐ ܕܦܘܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ̈ܐ –.
ܐܝܟ ܦܫܘܗ ܠܗ، ܡܙܕܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܠܫܢܐ:
ܘܙܪܥ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܠܒܙܪܐ ܒܩ̈ܠܐ ܚ̈ܕܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܘܒܒܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܗܘܬ ܗ، ܗ، ܕܗܘܬ:
ܕܓܫܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܘܐܘܟܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܫܘܠܦ ܡܠܐ.
ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܗܒܪ ܗܕܐ ܢܛܠ ܣܠܩܗ:
ܕܗܘܘ ܢܒܒ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܒܪܗ ܡܠܠܐܝܬ.
ܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܠܫܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܢܠܝ ܡܠܬ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܬܘܒ ܢܗܘܒ ܒܗܘܐ ܐܪܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܦܪܫ ܡܢ ܗܘ.
ܕܠܗ ܐܢܬܘܢ، ܒܗܘܪܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܡܕܡܟܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܓܫܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܘܐܠܦܢ ܡܠܬܐ * ܒܗ ܒܒܢܝܐ.
ܡܢ ܒܟܐ ܕܙܒܢܗ ܢܦܫܬ ܡܫܬܠ ܒܒܢ ܢܦܫܐ:

* f. 260v

---

283. ܘܡܟܐ] ܘܬܪܐ H — 284. ܗܘ] om. I | ܕܢܣܒܬ] ܘܢܣܒܬ H — 291. ܚܘܣܢܐ] read (?) ܪܚܘܣܢܐ — 292. ܐܘܡܢܐܝܬ] in marg. — 312. ܐܚܪܢܐ] read ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ as H — 313. ܘܗܘ] om. in. ܘ I

ܘܥܒܕܬ ܘܐܟܪܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܚ̈ܕܬܐ ܕܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܗ.
ܗܘ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܘܡܢܬ ܡܠܐ:
ܗܘ ܠܒܪ ܒܟܠܗ ܒܡܡܠܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܡܢ ܬܬ ܡܠܗ.
ܠܘ ܠܒܢܝܗ ܫܠܛ ܘܓܒܪ ܒܢܝܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܦܢܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܒܗ ܒܒܢܝܗ.
ܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܒܢܝܗ ܡܢ ܒܪ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܒܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ:
ܘܡܢܬ ܒܗܢܐ ܘܣܠܩܬ ܡܠܐ ܘܬܗܘܪܬ ܗ، ܒܗ.
ܒܢܬ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܢܫܘܬ ܗܘ ܘܕܒܒܗ:
ܘܐܙܗܒ ܐܢܘܢ – ܠܫܕܪ، ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܒܢܬ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܒܢܬ ܕܠܒܬ ܠܗ ܐܬܪܐ ܕܢܗܠܟ ܒܗ:
ܒܢܬ ܦܘܪܫܢܗ ܘܡܬܠܝ ܡܠܬܗ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܘܗ،.
ܒܢܬ ܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܗ، ܡܢ ܚܕ ܟܠ ܘܡܟܠ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܡܠܐ:
ܕܒܡܢܬܬܗ ܢܬܒܥܝܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܙܒܘܬܐ.
ܒܢܬ ܘܐܘܪܚܗ ܠܡܬܪܘܬܐ ܕܪ̈ܒܝܢܒܗܘܢ –:
ܘܫܩܠ ܡܢܗܘܢ – ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܬܗܪܐ ܕܠܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܬܡܢ ܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܢܦܠ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܐ ܒܠ ܡܕܝܢܐ:
ܘܬܘܪ ܘܡܬܒܘ ܒܪ ܡܬܕܡܪܝܢ ܒܐܢܝܐ ܕ ܠܒܥܬ.
ܚܘ ܒܚܕ̈ܪܐ ܒܪ ܬܘܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܕ:
ܕܗܘܢ – ܐܢܘܢ – ܐܘ ܕܠܒܟܐ ܒܝ ܚܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ.
ܠܒܘ ܚܕ ܒܡ ܚܕ ܡܠܐ ܕܢܘܒܪ، ܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܒܗܘ –:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܒܝܢ ܢܬ ܐܕܢܐ ܠܡܫܡܥ ܚܠܗ ܕܡܠܐ.
ܫܡܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܒܪ ܫܡܥܐ ܕܐܕܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܡܠܐ:
ܘܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܬܘܒ ܙܬܡܐ ܕܦܘܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܢܝܐ.
ܒܢܬ ܦܘܠܓ̈ܐ ܡܢܗ ܣܠܩ̈ܐ ܒܠ ܡܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ:
ܘܒܢܝܢ ܦܓܪܐ ܡܬܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܕܡ ܠܘ ܗܘܢܐ.
ܣܬܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܥܪܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܦܓܪܐ:
ܘܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܘܒܪ، ܗܘܐ ܠܒ ܠܡܫܡܥܐ ܕܐܕܢܐ.
ܬܡܢܗ – ܗܘ، ܒܢܝܢܐ ܘܐܕ̈ܢܐ ܚܕܐ ܒܣܒܪܬܗ:
ܕܚܕܐ ܚܙܝܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܫܡܥܐ ܡܢ ܒܘܢܝܐ.
ܦܘܡܐ ܒܫܬܦܐ ܡܬܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܒܢ̈ܝܬܗ:
ܕܐܝܟ ܠܒܝܢ ܠܒܪܐ ܦܪ̈ܫܐ ܗܘܘ ܠܐ ܢܒܒ.
ܬܗܪܐ ܘܬܡܗܐ ܙܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܘܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܒܡܕ̈ܢܐ:

---

331. ܘܡܬܒܘ] ܘܬܒ H — 336. ܕܐܕܢܐ] ܕܡܠܐ H

ܘܡܬܕܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܢܦܫܐ ܒܦܓܪܐ ܘܦܓܪܐ ܒܢܦܫܐ.
ܢܦܫܐ ܒܦܓܪܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܫܬܩܬ ܘܫܠܝܐ:
ܘܦܓܪܐ ܒܢܦܫܐ ܡܬܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܝܘܒܪܝ ܠܒܪܗ̇.
ܢܦܫܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܐܬܚܙܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܗܝ ܒܩܢܘܡܗ̇:
ܕܩܡ ܒܗ ܚܘܠܦ ܥܠ ܢܦܩܬܐ ܕܡܠܠܬܗ̇.
ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܗܝ ܠܗ̇:
ܕܠܡܐ ܐܡܪ: ܦܘܡܝ ܦܬܚܐ ܘܡܠܬ ܒܐܘܪܚܝ.
ܐܘ ܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܕܪܟܐ ܗܝ ܗܟܢ ܘܟܠܗ̇ ܬܗܪܐ ܗܝ:
ܕܫܡܥܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܥܠ ܢܦ̈ܫܬܗ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܐܠܐ.
ܐܘ ܫܪ̈ܬܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܢ̈ܝܢܬܐ ܡܫܬܟܚܢ ܗܘ̈:
ܕܟܕ ܚܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܢܦܫܐ ܘܦܓܪܐ ܗܘܘ ܦܠ̈ܓܐ.
ܐܘ ܟ̈ܠܠܐ ܕܐܘܒܕܘ ܡܠܬܐ ܘܐܫܬܒܩܘ ܟ̈ܠܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܚܕ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܚܕ ܠܫܢܐ ܗܘ ܦܠ̈ܓܐ.
ܩ̈ܠܐ ܫܪ̈ܬܐ ܡܬܚܠܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܝܬ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ:
ܘܡܬܕܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܒܚܘܠܦ ܩ̈ܠܐ.
ܘܦܪ ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܐܬ:
ܘܗܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܠܐ.
ܒܢܐ ܗܘܪ̈ܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܢܘܢܐ ܕܢܚܫܘܗܝ ܡܠܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܫܪ ܠܗ ܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܐ ܠܦܘܡܐ ܚܒܪܗ.
* ܠܒܪ ܗܘܡܝܐ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܙܢܐ ܒܠܫܢ ܒܣܪܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܣܩ ܒܣܪܐ ܠܡܦܪܫ ܠܒܪܐ ܕܒܣܪܐ ܒܢܬܗ.
ܙܒܢ ܡܕܝܢܐ ܠܐܠܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒ ܡܢ ܐܕܪ:
ܘܫܬܩ ܘܐܬܗܡܝ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܫܡܥ ܕܠܐ ܫܡܥ ܗܘܐ.
ܩܪܒ ܗܡܢܘܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܢܦܫܘܪ ܠܗ:
ܘܗܘܝ ܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܣܘ̈ܬܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܬܦܫܩ.
ܗܘ ܒܗ ܢܦܫܗ ܬܪ ܒܗ ܒܠܫ ܐܝܟ ܠܫܢܗ:
ܘܗܘ ܦܫܩ ܠܗ ܥܠ ܡܘܠܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܗ ܙܒܪܐ.
ܠܗܘܢ ܘܐܬܦܫܘ ܒܕ ܡܢ ܗܘܘ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܚܒܪܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܐܠܒܪܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܐ ܡܠܐ ܠܡܠܐ.
ܒܚܒܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܡܠ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܦܟܐ ܗܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܬܘܠܕ: ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܒܠܐ ܡܬܗܦܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܒܢܦܫܐ:

---

355. ܢܦ̈ܫܬܗ] read ܢܦ̈ܫܬܗ̇ as HI — 378. ܡܬܗܦܟܢ] ܬ above line | ܗܘܐ] foll. by erasure of 1 word

* f. 261r

ܘܐܣܬܕܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܬܪ̈ܥܝ ܦܘܡܐ ܩܕܡ ܡܦܩܬܗ.
ܗܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܐܘܠܕ: ܡܠܬܐ ܒܢܝ̈ ܢܫܐ:
ܗܘܘ ܕܐܣܪܗ ܠܬܪ̈ܥܐ ܒܐܦ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܬܦܩܘ.
ܡܠܬܐ ܫܬܩܬ ܒܝܬ ܚܫ̈ܟܐ ܘܐܘܒܕ ܡܠܬܐ:
ܘܗܝ ܗܝ ܕܫܬܩܬ ܘܗܝ ܗܝ ܕܡܠܬ ܒܟܠܢܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ.
ܚܕܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܬܦܠܓܬ ܠܡܢ̈ܝܢܬܐ:
ܘܡܢܗ̇ ܐܦܪܕ ܠܗܝܢ ܒܡ̈ܢܝܢܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܥܢܦܐ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܫܬܐ ܦܪܫܬ ܫܪ̈ܫܝܗ̇ ܠܟܠ ܐܬܪ̈ܘܢ:
ܗܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܝ ܚܝܠܗ̇ ܒܚܕܐ ܢܦܫܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܚܡܪܐ ܗܝ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܡܐܢܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܒܠܫܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܐܬܚܠܛ ܒܗ ܒܗ̇ ܡܕܡܝܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ ܦܘܡܗ ܒܡܫܚܐ:
ܘܟܠܠ ܒܠܫܢ ܒܦܝ ܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܠܡܬ ܒܥܡܗ.
ܣܘܟܐ ܘܐܣܛܘܟܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ ܒܗ̇ ܦܘܠܓܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܦܠܓ ܠܗ ܦܘܡ ܣܘܟܐ ܕܩܝܡ ܒܒܢܝܢܐ.
ܚܕܐ ܟܢܫ ܦܝ ܬܐ ܡܥܠܬ ܠܐܟܘ̈ܬܐ ܘܠܥܠܕ̈ܗܘܢ:
ܘܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܟܠܠ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܘܐܢܬܬܗ ܘܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܒܚܕܟܐ ܘܣܘܟܐ ܗܒܪܗ̇ ܠܗܕܐ ܗܘ ܡܬܩܡ ܒܠ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܠܛ ܒܢܝܐ ܘܦܠܓܐ ܕܢܦܬܘܬܐ.
ܒܦܠܓܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܐܫܢܝ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܒܝܘܬܪܐ ܕܢܟܣܐ.
ܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܝܗܒܗ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܫܘܚܬܗ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܦܠܓܐ ܒܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܢܦܩܘ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܣܒܬܗ.
ܘܟܕ ܦܠܓ ܗܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܬܘܒ ܢܣܒܬ:
ܥܣܩܐ ܦܠܓ ܠܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܫܘܚܬܗ.
ܐܬܐ ܕܥܣܩܐ ܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܗܘܐ ܠܢܘܚ ܘܠܙܪܥܗ:
ܘܚܘܠܦ ܠܐ ܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܙܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܠܕܘܟ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
ܐܣܟܝܡ ܣܦܪܐ ܘܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܒܟܢܫ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܕܐܪܡܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܦܠܓ ܚܠܘܗ ܒܪ̈ܝܚܐ.
ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܦܠܓ ܐܪܥܐ ܣܦܩ ܘܫܘܝ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܠܗ ܕܢܣܒ ܒܦܠܓܐ.
ܠܘ ܒܠ ܕܒܠܗ ܒܢܝܢ ܒܦܠܓܐ ܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ:

---

400. ܝܗܒܗ] ܝܗܒܗ̇ H

ܐܠܐ ܕܢܪܕܘܦ ܥܘܠܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܒܝܕ ܦܘܠܓܐ.
ܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܗܦܪ:
ܘܫܒܪܗ̇ ܒܫܒܚܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܠܡܫܦܪ ܥܒܕ.
ܢܕܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܪ ܢܘܚ ܕܢܩܘܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܢܦܫܐ:
ܕܡܪܕܐ ܡܢܗ̇ ܒܬܪ ܘܒܢܐ ܬܦܟܐ * ܕܬ̈ܠܐ. * f. 261v
ܡܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܗܢ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܩܕܡ ܠܡܒܕܩ.
ܘܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܫܒܝܐ ܘܐܪܒܐ.
ܠܘ ܫܘܥܒܐ ܚܪܬܐ ܢܓܪܗ ܠܗܘܬ ܦܘܠܓܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܫܚܬܐ ܕܒܬܗ ܘܢܚܬ ܘܢܗܒ ܠܥ̈ܡܐ.
ܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܫܚܠܬܐ ܡܚܕ ܕܢܬܠ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܟܢܫܗ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܫܪܝ ܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܠܕܒܢܬ ܐܕܡ.
ܐܦ ܠܒܪ ܬܘܒ ܒܟܠܗ ܦܐܪܐ ܐܟܠ ܡܘܬܐ:
ܕܢܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܐܢܫ ܕܪܐ ܒܡ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ.
ܐܦ ܠܛܘܦܢܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܥܘܠܐ ܐܒܕ ܕܒܕܐ:
ܕܢܡܟܐ ܦܠܓܘ̈ܬܐ ܒܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܟܬܪ.
ܡܛܠ ܥܘܠܐ ܠܛܠܗ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܘܒܒܢܗ ܒܒܪܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܢܗܠ ܡܪܐܝܬ ܒܐܒܐ ܕܠܒܗ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ, ܢܦܫܬ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܝ ܕ: ܒܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ:
ܕܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܡܠܐ ܕܦܘܠܓ ܐܢܫܐ ܢܫܡ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܡܛܠ ܥܢܝܐ ܢܦܫܬ ܝ ܒܢܝܗ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܢܦܫܬ:
ܘܥܡ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܘ ܠܗܐ.
ܢܝܐ ܕܢܦܛܠܝܢ ܠܡܒܢܝܐ ܡܕܪܐ ܡܪܐܝܬ:
ܘܢܦܫ ܦܬܪܗ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܥܘܠܐ ܒܕܠܐ ܢܚܡ.
ܢܝܐ ܕܗܘܡܢ ܠܡܫܟܢܐ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܠܡܫܡ ܝ ܐܪܗܘܢ:
ܘܐܥܒܕ ܡܠܐ ܘܟܪܙ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ.
ܦܩܕ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܦܩܘܕ ܕܢܟܐ ܥܠ ܫܘ̈ܩܘܢ:
ܘܒܕܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܕܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܒܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܒܫܢܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܥܠܝܡܐ:
ܘܐܦܪܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܢܝܐ ܡܫܢܝܐ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܡܠܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܪܡܝ ܒܦܘܡܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܥܠܝܡܐ:
ܘܢܒܥ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܒܢܬ ܐܣܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܐ ܚܕܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ:

---

415. ܬܦܟܐ] read ܬܦܩܐ as HI — 423. ܕܢܐܠܦ] read ܕܢܠܦ as H | ܕܪܐ] in marg.

ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܥܒܕܘܢ ܡܕܪܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܥܠ ܡܪܘܬܗ.
ܡܚܠܠܐ ܫܕܬܐ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܙܪܥܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܥܒܠܐ:
ܘܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܠܗ ܒܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܕܟܘܪ ܠܓܐ.
ܒܟܐ ܕܢܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܢ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܪ̈ܘܢܐ:
ܠܗܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܐܦܩ ܠܐܕܡ ܡܢ ܦܪܕܝܣܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܒܫܠܡܬܐ ܐܦܩ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܕܡ:
ܕܟܐܕܡ ܘܒܗܘܢ ܢܦܩ ܐܪܥܐ ܠܫܢ̈ܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ, ܦܪܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܠܘܢ ܒܡܕܪܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܘܢܫܟܢܐ ܡܛܠܠܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܢܗܘܘ ܒܙܪܐ ܕܒܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬ̈ܪܘܗܝ:
ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܥ ܘܡܦܩܝܢ ܠܕܪ̈ܐ ܟܕ ܠܗ ܬܪ ܐܪܥܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܚܬܪܘ ܒܐܪܥ ܒܟܠ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܕܪܐ:
ܡܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ̇ ܥܠ ܒܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܪ ܠܓܗܘܢ.
ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܢܗܒ ܐܦܣܘ ܥܠ ܟܘܪ̈ܗܘܢ:
ܥܘܠܐ ܒܥܘܦܐ ܡܬܬܘܣܦ ܗܘܐ ܒܟܢܫ ܡܟܢܫܗܘܢ.
ܥܦܪ ܡܕܡ ܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܒܕܪ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܕܠܐ ܒܥܒܕܘܬܗܘܢ ܬܫܦܠܓܐ ܥܘܠܐ ܘܬܕܠܘܫ ܥܢܫܐ.
ܢܦܩܘ ܡܢ ܒܟܠ ܠܡܦܠܚ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܐܫܬܕܪܘ ܠܗ:
ܘܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܐܫܟܚ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܫܡܗ ܙܒܢܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܕܗܢܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܙܒܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ:
ܘܫܘ, ܐܢܘܢ ܥܒܕ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܕܠܟܠ ܦܢ̈ܝܢ.
ܠܗܘܢ ܐܬܠܗ, ܗܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܦܠܓ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܘܒܗܘܢ ܥܠ, ܠܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܒܢܬ ܡܕܝܢܬܗܘܢ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܙܒܢܐ ܠܥܒܪ, ܠܒܐ:
ܘܫܕܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܥܡܪ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܐܫܬܕܪܘ ܠܗ.
ܣܦܪܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܓܠܒ ܥܠ ܠܘ̈ܚܐ ܕܕܒܝܫܘܬܗܘܢ:
ܘܐܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܪܐ ܥܦܪܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ * ܕܒܗܘܢ. * f. 262r
ܡܢܘ ܘܐܬܗ ܠܗ ܒܡܬܠ̈ܬܐ ܕܫܥܒܕܗܘܢ:
ܘܦܫܛ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܗܢܐ ܒܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܠܫܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܗܘܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܠܡܡܠܠܐ ܫܕܬܐ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܠܗܘܢ:
ܘܗܒܗ ܡܢܘ̈ܬܐ ܠܕܘܒܪ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ.
ܒܗܘ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܠܒܢܝܐ ܒܠܫܢܐ:

---

448. ܕܒܫܠܡܬܐ] before corr. foll. by ܐܢܘܢ — 460. ܠܡܦܠܚ] ܠܡܦܠܚܘ I — 467. ܠܡܥܡܪ] ܠܡܥܡܪܘ I — 472. ܕܐܘܠܕ] ܕܐܘܠܕܘ I

ܘܥܒܪܘ ܗܪ ܓܒܢ ܒܥܦܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܦܠܓܪܐ ܘܦܩܥܐ.
ܠܫܘܬܪܢ ܡܪܝܡ ܗܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܗܘܬ ܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܚܟܡܬܐ:
ܘܫܒܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܒܪܗ̇ ܠܟܠܐ ܝܢ ܒܥܘܬܢ.
ܫܘܒܚܐ ܘܙܝܚܐ ܡܠܝܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܕܕ:
ܘܟܠܬ ܥܒܕܐ ܗܝ ܠܒܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܘܠܬ̈ܘܚܐ.
ܡܠܐܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܕܒܠܥ̈ܢܐ:
ܘܡܬܪܘ ܡܢܗ ܐܪ̈ܝܚܐ ܘܒܣ̈ܡܢܐ.
ܚܘ ܙܘܚܐ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܢܘܗܝ ܠܓܒܐ ܠܓܢܣ:
ܘܡܘܢ ܡܣܒܪܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘ ܡܣܒܪܐ ܠܟܢܘܫܬܢ.
ܚܘ ܕܐܫܬܚܠܦ ܡܠ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܢܝܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܗܦܟܘ ܢܓ̈ܕܐ ܗܘܘ ܒܘܫܟܐ ܠܡܬܠܓܕ̈ܐ.
ܢܓ̈ܕܐ ܡܥܢ̈ܝܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܬܘ ܢܣܘܬ:
ܘܗܦܟܗܝ ܙܘܥܐ ܘܢܣܘܬ ܦܠܚܘ ܕܥܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ.
ܥܒܕܐ ܦܠܚ ܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܐܪܗܛ ܐܚܪܢܐ:
ܕܕܠܒܐ ܢܝܘܢ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܕܕܒܪ ܒܟܠܐ ܗܘ.
ܪܗܒܘܢ ܚܝ̈ܠܐ ܒܓܠ ܥܡ ܡܠܐ ܘܐܥܡܪ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܕܢܝ ܘܪ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܗܝ ܕܒܬܪܐ ܒܥܠܡ ܪܒ̈ܢܐ.
ܐܪܙܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܒܗܢ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܕܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܚܟܡܬܐ:
ܕܗܝ ܡܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܠܥܠܡ̈ܢܐ ܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܢܘܪܐ.
ܗܝ ܕܒܬܪܐ ܦܪܫ ܟܪܡ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܗܘܬ:
ܕܢܟܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܠܒܢܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܬܬܬܒܪ ܠܚܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܐ.
ܒܬܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܓܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܠܥ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܢܗܘܐ ܠܥܢ̈ܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܥܢ̈ܐ ܐܝܟ ܪܗܘܒܢܐ.
ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܢܙܥ ܠܝ ܡܠܐ ܕܦܠܓ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܢܕܐ ܠܗܒܕܐ ܕܠܡܐܡ ܥܒܕܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ.
ܒܗܕܡ ܡܘܫܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܓܠܐ ܘܐܠܦ ܠܝ:
ܕܒܗܘܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܦܠܚܘ ܒܥܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܥܢ̈ܐ.
ܗܘܢ ܦܠܚܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܕܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܘܪ ܓܠܐ:
ܘܗܘܢ ܬܘܒ ܡܗܒܘ ܫܠܝܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ.
ܚܠ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܘܠܦܘ ܡܒܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܢ ܬܐܬܘܗܝ:
ܕܕܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܬܐ ܘܐܣܪܝܬܐ.
ܠܗ ܣܒܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܡܬܠܝܢ ܟܠ:
ܕܢܘܗܝ ܫܒܚܗ ܘܢܥܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܫܬܪܬܗ.

---

504. ܬܐܬܘܗܝ] add. sey. H

Homily V

On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle

Sigla of Manuscripts

A = London, British Library, Oriental 5463
B = Leningrad, The Institute of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5
C = London, British Library, Oriental 9367
D = Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55
I = Teheran, Neesan 1

ܕܝܠܗ ܒܕ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܘܚܕ. ܕܟܬܝܒ ܠܗ ܥܠ
ܬܘܬܒܐ ܕܥܠܡ ܗܢܐ. ܘܠܚܡ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܒܥܕܬܐ.

ܒܪܬܐ ܕܬܘܒܐ ܒ̇ܪܐ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܝ؛ ܡܠܟܐ:
ܕܢܐܠܦ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܗܘܝܘ ܕܒ̇ܪܐ ܒܪܬܐ ܒܪܫܝܬ.
ܥܠܡܐ ܥܡܘܦܐ ܡ̣ܢ ܪ ܒܢܝܗ ܡܕܡ ܒܪ ܒܣܬܗ:
ܕܢܒܙܙ ܣܠܩܐ ܕܐܘܡܢܘܬܗ ܠܣܠ̈ܩ ܪܘܡܐ.
ܣܠ̈ܩ ܪܘܡܐ ܚܙܐ ܣܠܩܗ ܥܠ ܛܘܪ ܦܫܝ:
ܕܢܣܘܢ ܣܠܩܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܐܘܗܝ، ܒܪܫܝܬ ܕܗܘܬ.
ܒܗ̇ܘ ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܒ̇ܪܐ ܒܪܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ:
ܪ̣ ܕܡܢܬܐ ܕܥܠܡ ܗܢܐ ܘܫܘܝܗ، ܠܒܢܝܗ.
ܒܥܠܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܡ̣ܢ ܟܐ ܕܢܒܕܘ ܥܠ ܪܒܘܬܗ:
ܘܒܬܘܡܗ ܪܫܡ ܬܘܡܐ ܕܪܘܡܐ ܘܥܘܡܩܐ.
ܒܐܘܡܢ ܡܘܡܝܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܒܠܫ̈ܢܐ ܡ̣ܢ ܗܪ ܒܐܪܥܐ:
ܐܪܥܢܐ ܘܫܡܝܢܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ.
ܬܪܝܢ ܥܠܡܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܗܘܢ ܕܢܬܒܥܘܢ ܥܠܝܐ:
ܕܒ̇ܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܕܡ ܘܡܣܒܪ ܠܗ.
ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܒ̇ܪܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܕܒ̇ܪܐ:
ܘܦܠܓܐ ܒܥܠܡܐ ܘܦܪܕ ܐܝܟ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܝ؛ ܡܠܟܐ.
ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܘܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܦ̇ܪܐ ܕܢܣܩܘܢ ܒܥܠܡܐ ܕܒܥܠܡܗ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܫ̈ܪܐ ܥܠ ܣܘܪܗܘܬܗ ܘܥܠ ܬܘܡܡܗ.
ܕܡܬܐ ܕܠܬܠܝܘܗ̇ ܡ̣ܢ ܥܠ ܛܘܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܠܝܘܗ̇:
ܕܟܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܣܘ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ.
ܐܘܡܢܘܬ ܡ̣ܢ ܕܡܢܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܪܘܟܒܐ:
ܕܪܘܒܒܗܝܢ ܬܢ̈ܙܙ ܒܓܒܘܗ̇، ܒܪܘܚܬܗ.
ܙܪܥܐ ܕܫܡܗ ܪܫܡ ܒܫܬܐ ܘܫܘܝܗ، ܐܝܟ:
ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܠܓܘܢ ܥܠ ܐܬܘܬܗ ܕܕܠܐ ܫܘܪ،.
ܫܡܗ ܦܫܩ ܠܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܫܬܐܣܬܐ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܒܥܠܡܗ:
ܘܒܠܡܗ، ܫܠܠ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ ܘܒܠܡܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ.

Title. ܕܝܠܗ ܒܕ ܕܝܠܗ. ܥܠ ܬܘܬܒܐ ܕܡܫܟܢܝܢܐ. ܘܠܚܡ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܒܥܕܬܐ. BCD -- 7. ܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ] ܐܘܡܢܐ CD -- 11. ܒܐܘܡܢ] ܒܐܘܡܢܘܬ BCDI — 15. ܒܪܐ ܥܠ] read ܒܪܐ as BCDI

ܫܡܗ ܬܘܒ ܐܘܚܕ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܦܘܪܠܐ ܒܐܪ̈ܙ ܡܘܫܐ:
ܘܦܫܛ ܫ̈ܘܠܐ ܘܓܒܠܐ ܒܠܒܗܝܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܫܡܗ.
ܒܫ̈ܠܐ ܐ̈ܠܦܗ ܠܡܒܢܐ ܚܝܠܗ ܒܡܬ̈ܒܬܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܒܪ̈ܘܡܐ ܫܪܪ ܐܚܝ ܒܢ ܐܬ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܒܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܢ ܓܒܝܐ ܒܝܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܬ ܡܘܫܬܐ:
ܘܪܡܙܗ ܒܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܗ݁ܘ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ.
ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܠܡܐ ܠܡܬܩܢܘܬܗ:
ܘܒܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܒܪ݁ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܘܥܒܕ ܡܕܡ.
ܒܡܬܪܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܗܘ݁ ܥܠܡܐ ܓ ܪ ܠܗ ܪܡܙܐ:
ܕܢܕܡܐ [ܒܗ] ܘܒܥܒܕ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܥܠ̈ܡܐ.
ܘܗ݁ܘ ܓ ܒܝܬܐ ܕܓܒܪܐ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ:
ܗܘ ܫܘ݂ܝ ܠܗ ܚܝܬܐ ܦܐܝܬܐ ܕܕܡܝܐ ܠܡܕܡ.
ܚܝ ܠܡ ܘܒܥܕ ܐܒܪ ܓ ܐܕܘܗܝ ܚܝܠ ܒܥܘܕܪܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܡܥܐ ܙܘܥܐ ܕܓ ܪܬ ܡܘܕܡܢܝܢ.
ܚܝ ܓ ܘܪ ܥܩܒܪ ܢܘܡܝܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܥܠ̈ܡܐ:
ܕܡܣܒܢܘܗܝ ܒܐܪܟܐ ܘܕܡ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܢܬܒܘܢ ܒܗ.
ܒܒܪ ܚܕ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܒܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܒܒܝܬ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ:
* f. 208r ܘܡܢܐ ܕܐܬܬܩܢ ܦܠܘ ܠܒܗ * ܠܬܪܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ.
ܦܪܣܐ ܐܪܡܐ ܒܝܬ ܚܕ ܠܐܚܪܝܢ ܘܦܪܫ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܦܪܫ ܪܩܝܥܐ ܕܡܬܚܫܒ ܬܪܝܢ ܬܘܩܢ̈ܐ.
ܒܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܦܠܓܗ ܠܒܪ̈ܝ ܠܬܪܝܢ ܒܡܕ̈ܝܢ:
ܒܒܪ ܠܟ ܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܢܝܫܐ ܪܘܡܐ ܘܦܠܘ ܠ ܒܒܠܟ.
ܡ̈ܚܬܐ ܡܬܬܘܣ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܘܓܪܪ ܐܚܝ:
ܘܚܠܦ ܐܦ̈ܝܐ ܐܒܪܟ ܐܚܝ ܕܦ̈ܐ ܦܠܓܢܐ.
ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܘܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܒܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܡܬܬܩܢ ܐܢܬ:
ܒܗܘ ܐܣܟܡܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܥܠܡܐ.
ܥܠܡܐ ܘܥܠܡܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܘܕܒܬܪ ܬܠܬ ܓ ܒܢܝ:
ܬܡܢ ܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܘܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܣܟܡܢܐ.
ܠܥܠܡܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܠܝܬܗ ܕܒܢܐ ܕܒܒܘ̈ܪܝܬܐ:
ܫܘܪ ܬܡܐܢܬ ܘܣܡܢ ܥܠܡܝܢ ܠܡܥܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܣܡܢ ܓ ܒܬ̈ܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ:
ܘܒܗܘ ܕܠܓܘ ܣܡܢ ܕܒܢܐ ܕܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ.

---

[31] ܕܡܕܝܢ] om. in. ܕ D — 36. [ܒܗ]] om. AI, read as BCD — 42. ܕܡܣܒܢܘܗܝ] read ܘܡܣܒܢܘܗܝ as BCD — 52. ܐܣܟܡܢܐ] ܐܣܟܡܐ CD

ܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܘܦܓܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܓܒܗ ܘܒܢܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܐ ܕܡ̈ܟܐ ܒܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܬ̈ܒܢܝܢ ܠܒ̈ܢܝ ܐ̈ܕܡ.
ܐܘ ܒܒܢܝܐ ܕܓܒܠ ܥܠ̈ܡܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ:
ܕܡܠܟ ܒܒܢ̈ܘܗܝ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܗ ܠܡܒܢܐ ܡܕܡ.
ܐܘ ܓ ܢܘܐ ܕܝ ܪ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܒܪ ܠܒܬ ܐܚܝ:
ܕܓܒܠܐ ܒܬܘܒܐ ܘܪܫܡ ܐܚܝ ܡܕܡ ܒܪ ܒܒܪ̈ܝܡ.
ܐܘ ܕ ܓܒܠܐ ܐܣܟܡܢܘܬܗ ܒܐܣܟܡܢܘܬܗ:
ܕܠܒܪ ܚܝܠܗ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܓܠ̈ܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܫܡܥ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܐܘ ܠܟ ܐܦ ܠܟ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܐܬܘܗܝ ܓܒܝܠ ܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ:
ܕܢܫܠܡ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܡܒܢܝܘ ܒܡܬܩܢܝܢ.
ܐܘ ܠܟ ܡܒܥܐ ܓܒܠܐ ܪܦܝܐ ܥܠܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܢܝܐ:
ܕܗ݂ܘܐ ܡܕܪܟ ܒ݂ܪܐ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܘܝܐ.
ܐܘ ܠܟ ܦܐܝܐ ܫܦܝܪ ܡܢ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܐ:
ܕܒܪܬ ܡܠܬܟ ܪܗܛܐ ܕܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܘܕܫܡܝ̈ܢܐ.
ܒܡ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܪܗܛ ܡܠܬܢܝܐ:
ܘܓܠܐ ܠܥܝܢ ܟܠ ܓ ܒܢ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܙ̈ܝ ܠܗ.
ܡܠܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܠܒܪܬ ܒܒܗ ܪܘܚܢܐܝܬ:
ܘܡܢ ܪܬܗ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܠܡܒܪܢ ܫ̈ܠܐ ܒܝܢ ܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ.
ܒܝܢ ܣܘܟܠ̈ܐ ܓܒܪ ܒܠܡܕܡ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܗ:
ܒܚܝܠ ܗܘ ܚܝܠܐ ܓܒܪ ܒܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܘܒܪܘܝܘܬܗ.
ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܕܒܢܝܐ ܓܒܪ ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܦܩܕ:
ܘܦܠܓܗ ܠܬܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܢܘܡܝܐ ܘܒܡܥܡܠܐ.
ܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܥܠ̈ܡܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܘܕܒܬܪ ܓܒܗ ܒܒܢܘܗ:
ܘܟܬܒ ܘܡܠܝܗ ܐܣܟܡܢ ܕܒܪ ܕܬܢܝ ܘܕܠܗܠ.
ܬܪܝܢ ܕܡܒ̈ܪܐ ܫܘ ܠܐܝܢܐ ܒܝܬ ܓܒܗܘܢ:
ܘܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܓܪ ܓܒܗܐ ܕܣܡ ܒܬܪܝܗܘܢ.
ܒܗܘ ܒܪܢܐ ܓܒܗ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܦܓܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ:
ܘܒܗܘ ܕܠܓܘ ܢܒܥ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ.
ܦܓܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܦܩܕ ܒܬܪܝܗܘܢ:
ܠܦܘܬ ܪܘܟܒܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܦܓܪ ܘܪܘܚ.
ܠܦܓܪܐ ܐܦܩ ܠܡܥܠ ܒܠܥܕ ܠܗܘ ܒܪܢܐ:
ܘܠܢܦܫܐ ܠܓܘܝܐ ܕܒܠܥܕ ܒܝܬ ܪܒ ܒܡܪ̈ܘܐ.

ܟܡ ܪܒܪܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܚܝ̈ܠ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܡܚܝ̈ܐ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܠܟܠ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܐܪܥܢܐ ܗܘ.
ܪܘܫܢܘܬ ܚܝ̈ܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܗܘ ܠܟܗܢܐ:
ܐܦ ܪܒܪܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܟܐܪܙ ܪ̈ܘܫܢܐ ܚܝ̈ܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ.
ܐܪܙܢܘܬ ܪܝܫ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܗ ܘܗܘ ܒܪܐ:
ܘܠܦܘܬ * ܕܡܫܝܚܗ ܐܦ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. * f. 208v
ܠܕܝܠܗ ܒܠܫܢ: ܡܦܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܦܓܪܐ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ:
ܘܡܬܚܫܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܒܥܐ ܒܪܘܚܢܘܬܐ.
ܕܗܒ ܦܓܪܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܗܘ ܒܪܐ:
ܘܦܓܪܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܦܘܡ ܦܓܪܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܫܢ ܗܘ̈ܝ ܒܗ.
ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܡܢܬܐ ܡܬܕܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܡܠ̈ܬܗ:
ܘܣܕ̈ܪܐ ܕܠܚܡܐ ܡܬܣܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܦܬܘܪܗ.
ܡܢܪܬܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܡܢܗܪܬܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܩܒܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ:
ܘܠܟܠ ܡܢܗ ܐܫܬܡܫ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܡܢܝܢ ܢܘܗ̈ܪܐ.
ܒܠܗ ܪܗܛܐ ܕܦܘܡ ܫܡܫܐ ܡܫܡܫܢ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܚܠ ܐܣܛܠ̈ܘܡܫܐ ܚܡܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ.
ܠܦܘܬ ܥܒܪ̈ܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܠܐܪܒܥ ܦܢ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܡܠܒܫ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܢܗܝܪ ܫܡܫܐ.
ܠܒܘܫܐ ܪܒܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܘܫܗ ܠܕܝܢܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܠܦܘܬ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܡܬܦܫܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܦܘܩܕ̈ܢܘܗܝ.
ܒܟܠܗ ܕܟܠܗܐ ܡܬܦܬܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܪܘܚܠܗ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܫܘܫܠ̈ܬܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܗܘ̈ܝ ܒܗ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܬܐ.
ܒܦܪܓܐ ܚܡܫ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܒܚ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܦܬܘܪ ܠܡܫܚܐ:
ܕܡܕܒܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܙܝ، ܫܘܒܚܬܐ ܘܫܘܚܠܦ ܙܒ̈ܢܐ.
ܫܘܚܠܦ ܙܒ̈ܢܐ ܡܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܕ̈ܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܦܬܘܪ̈ܐ:
ܘܡܪܝܚ ܥܛܪܐ ܡܬܒܪܟܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ ܡܕܪ̈ܚܝܗܘܢ.
ܒܥܬܐ ܡܕܪܝܢ ܬܪܒܝ ܡܪܝܚ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܘܒܠܫ: ܡܕܢܚܗܘܢ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܡܪܝܚ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܗܘܐ.
ܡܪ̈ܥܐ ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܡܗܝܡܢܬ ܕܪ̈ܟܐ ܘܬܪܡܢܬ ܦܐܪ̈ܐ:
ܘܦܠܚ ܐܦ ܗܕܪܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܦܓܪܢܐ ܡܫܬܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܒܠܫܢܐ ܡܠܝܢ ܫܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܐܪܥܢܐ ܗܘ:
ܥܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܚܫܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܫܢܐ ܒܠܫܢ: ܥܠ ܦܬܘܪܐ.

---

102. ܥܠ] above line D — 112. ܒܗ] om. I — 115. ܦܬܘܪ̈ܐ] read ܦܬܘܪܐ as BCDI

ܒܗܝܢ ܐܣܡܝܢܐ ܡܫܬܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܗܕܪܐ ܠܦܓܪܢܐ:
ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܚܢܝܢ ܠܗܘܒܠ ܠܒܘܫܐ ܕܒܢܗܪ̈ܐ.
ܟܐܪܙ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܐ ܚܙܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܡܢܪܬܐ ܒܕܠܩܝܗ:
ܘܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܕܝܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܒܗܘܢܐ ܠܗܒܪܐ ܕܫܡܫܐ.
ܟܬܒܢܐ ܦܢܝܬܐ ܫܡܗ ܪܒܐ ܕܫܡ ܢܡܘܣܐ:
ܘܐܦ̈ܝܗ ܠܦܓܪܢܐ ܒܗܘ ܐܣܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܣܦܪ ܫܡܫܐ.
ܒܡܗ ܕܫܡܫܐ ܡܬܒܪܟܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܒܪܘܒܢܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܒܦܓܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܘܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܘ̈ܗܝ.
ܒܠܗ ܦܓܪܢܐ ܕܒܢܗܝܪܐ ܡܦܠܓܣ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܡܚܝܢ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܘܫܘܚܠܦ ܡܪ̈ܥܐ ܡܫܡܫܢ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ.
ܥܒܕ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ ܘܗܘ، ܒܗ ܒܥܒܬܐ:
ܘܫܒܩܐ ܚܛ̈ܗܐ ܠܒܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܪܫܗ.
ܒܡܚܝܢ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܒܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܦܓܪܢܐ ܕܕܠܦ̈ܐ ܕܟܠܝܗ:
ܘܡܦܓܪܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܫܒܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܘܟܐ.
ܐܫܬܐ ܫܒ̈ܠܬ ܡܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ ܘܗܘ، ܒܟܡ ܚܠܬܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܬܘܡ ܟܠܐ ܘܫܒܬܐ ܠܢܪ̈ܬܐ.
ܗܘ ܬܘܡܢܐ ܕܐܫܬܐ ܡܘ̈ܬܢ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܩܕܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܟ ܝܘܡ ܫܒܬܐ ܕܦܪܫܗ ܡܪܝܐ.
ܫܒܬܐ ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܡܬܒܚܢܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܫܒܥܐ ܙܒ̈ܢܐ:
ܘܕܠܩ̈ܐ ܕܟܠܝܗ ܐܝܟ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܐ ܕܟܐܦ̈ ܪܘܡܐ.
ܒܫܒܥܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܘܗܪܗ ܒܠܚܘܕ:
ܠܦܘܬ ܕܐܦ ܫܒܥܐ ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܠܝܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܒܠܚܘܕ.
ܠܩܘܕܫ ܩܘܕ̈ܫܐ ܠܐ ܢܓܗ ܗܘܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܡܢܗ:
* ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܕܠܓܘ ܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ. * f. 209r
ܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܕܠܓܘ ܚܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܗܘ ܠܟܗܢܐ:
ܘܡܬܚܫܒ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܫܬܟܚ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܠܒ ܟܐܪܙܐ ܗܘ:
ܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܗ ܥܠ ܕܒܠܬ̈ܢ ܡܫܬܒܚܢ ܗܘ̈ܝ.
ܒܕܒܚܐ ܕܡܦܪܐ ܐܦ ܒܢܬ ܒܡܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ:
ܥܠ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܕܒܘܬ ܢܩܫܐ ܡܬܢܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܡܦܓܪܐ ܕܡܫܒ̈ܚܐ ܚܝ̈ܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܐܦ ܪܒܪܒܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܫܕܐ ܒܥܒܬܐ ܡܒܣܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܟܠܗ، ܘܥܠ ܟܠܗܐ.

---

145. ܠܩܘܕܫ] ܠܩܕܘܫ BCD — 151. ܒܗ] ܒܗ̇ BCD

ܚܘܣܝ ܚܘ̈ܒܐ ܘܪܘܚ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܡܨܠܐ ܘܚܘܒܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܟܠܗ ܐܦ ܡܦܩܬܗ.
ܡܨܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܕ: ܡܨܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܚܘ̈ܒܬܗ:
ܘܚܘܒܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ: ܡܚܠܬܗ ܠܡܚܒ ܪܚܡܐ.
ܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ ܡܬܒܕܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ: ܡܢ ܒܫܘܬܗ:
ܘܥܠ ܫܘܒ̈ܚܐ ܕܗܘܘ ܘܗܘܝܢ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܡܨܠܐ ܘܡܥܨܠܐ ܒܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܗܘ̈ܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܪ:
ܐܘܟܠܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܓܒܘܫܬ ܒܗ̈ܘܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܠܘܝ.
ܒܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܥܡܝܢܬܐ:
ܘܒܕ ܡܪ̈ܦܐ ܓܒܘܪܬ ܚ̈ܛܐ ܠܐ ܡܟܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܒܨܠܡܗ ܕܕܡܐ ܕܡܬܦܫܩ ܗܘܐ ܥܡܗ ܚܘܫܒܐ:
ܚܘܣܝ ܚܘ̈ܒܐ ܕܒܡܫܝܚ ܡܬܦܫܩ ܗܘܐ.
ܒܥܡ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܠܨܠܡܗ:
ܠܘ ܕܡܫܡܫܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܐܪܙܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܡܫܢܐ.
ܐܪܙ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܨܠܡܗ ܢܒܥܘܫܐ:
ܘܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܢܓܠܝܘܗܝ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܠܨܠܡܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܨܠܡܐ ܚܛܝܐ:
ܕܠܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܢܓܠܐ ܘܢܓܠܘܢ ܐܪܙܗ ܒܕ ܦܘܪ̈ܩܢܐ.
ܠܚܘܣܝ ܚܘ̈ܒܐ ܕܒܦܘܪ̈ܩܢܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܚܝܠ ܚܘ̈ܒܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܕܡ.
ܡܚܝܠ ܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܗ ܡܢ ܕܠܡܨܠܝܐ ܒܨܠܐ ܕܐܕ̈ܡܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܫܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܥܪܐ ܒܗܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܥܡ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܦܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ:
ܘܡܗܕܒ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܘܪܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܬܐ.
ܥܡ̈ܗܐ ܥܐܠܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܪ̈ܩܢܐ ܡܬܟܠܦ ܗܘܐ:
ܠܨܠܡܐ ܚܫܝܠܐ ܐܦ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܐܪܙ ܚܘܫܒܐ.
ܒܠ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܕ ܒܚܝܠܘܗܝ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܒܟܐ ܡܚܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܒܫ ܓܠܝܢܗ.
ܒܥܒܐ ܕܨܠܡܐ ܦܓܪܘܬܗ ܡܫܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܚܝܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܒܚܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ.
ܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܚܘܣܝ ܚܘ̈ܒܐ ܒܫܬܡܫܬܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܐ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ.

---

157. ܒܕ] ܒܪ BCD — 161. ܘܡܥܨܠܐ ܒܡܘܕܝܢܐ] corr. from inv. C — 165. ܒܨܠܡܗ] read ܒܨܠܡܐ as BCD — 167. ܠܨܠܡܗ] read ܠܨܠܡܐ as BCD — 169. ܗܘܐ] above line D | ܒܨܠܡܗ] read ܒܨܠܡܐ as BCD

ܚܝܠ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܫܠ ܠܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܘܠܫܡܫܬܗ:
ܘܒܚܝܠ ܚܝܠܗ ܢܦܩ ܚܘܫܬܐ ܒܡܚܘܬܬܐ.
ܡܬܚܘܬ ܐܝܟܐ ܡܬܒܪ̈ܙܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܫܬܡܫܬܗ ܕܨܠܡܐ:
ܘܒܓܠܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܗܘܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܦܓܪܐ.
ܪܘܚ ܓܠܝܢܐ ܢܦܫ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܒܫܬܡܫܬܗ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܒܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܚܝܢ.
ܒܗ ܡܠܦ ܗܘܐ ܒܗܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܐܪܙ ܒܫܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܕܚܝ ܚܝܠ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܒܕ ܒܪ ܓܒܫܐ.
ܒܡܘܕܥ ܡܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܫܪܥܐ ܒܠ ܐܪܘܥܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܡܢܗ ܒܬܠܬ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܠܡܒܕܪܘ.
ܒܪܘܟܐ ܫܪ̈ܥܐ ܡܚܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܠܫܬܡܫܬܗ:
* ܒܐܣܡܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܡܫ̈ܪܝܢܐ ܠܟܠܬ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ. * f. 209v
ܒܟܠܬ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ ܡܬܚܕܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܕܗܒܐ ܚܫܝܠܐ:
ܘܠܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܒܗ ܚܙܪ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܚܘܫܒܗ.
ܘܐܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܣܦܠܝܐ ܡܥܒܕ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ:
ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܒܠܬܐ ܕܗ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܒܫܬܡܫܐ.
ܠܡܢܐ ܗܡܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܡܘܕܥ ܡܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܥܐ:
ܘܡܚܕܪ ܗܘܐ ܐܪܙ ܒܫܘ̈ܬܐ ܘܚܘܫܒܗ ܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܠܟܢ ܟܠ ܫܢܬܗ ܦܝܫ ܗܘܐ ܒܗܝܢܐ ܡܢܐ ܕܥܐܠ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܟܢ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܡܬܗܠܟ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܒܕܩ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ.
ܠܟܢ ܠܐ ܒܪܘܟܐ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܫܪܥܝܢ:
ܕܗܐ ܒܬܝܒ ܕܡܢܗ ܡܬܡܚܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܓܠܝܢܐ.
ܠܟܢ ܐܦ ܒܗܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܥܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܘܗܝ ܒܠܥܕ:
ܘܡܢܐ ܕܥܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܟܢ ܥܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܒܦܘܪܢܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ.
ܠܟܢ ܡܢ ܫܪܥܐ ܡܬܡܚܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܘܗܝ:
ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܙܘܕܐ ܡܢ ܒܪ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܚܝܠ ܐܬܘܬܐ.
ܠܟܢ ܒܠ ܒܠܗ ܒܡܢ ܒܥܘܬܗ ܕܨܠܡܐ ܡܫܬܐ:
ܘܒܠ ܡܢ ܡܢܐ ܙܒܢܗ ܡܠܟܐ ܦܪܩ ܫܬܡܫܐ.
ܚܙܘ ܡܘܕܝܐ ܒܚܝܠ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܕܒܚܝܠ ܦܓܪ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܚܝ ܕܦܫܪ ܒܗ ܚܫܒܢ ܒܗܬܐ ܕܐܪܙܐ.
ܒܗܬܐ ܡܠܝܐ ܐܦ ܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܕܡܫܒܚ ܕܒܫܢܝܢ:
ܕܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܘܡܘܕܥܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ.

---

191. ܓܠܝܢܐ] add. sey. BCD -- 199. ܕܕܗܒܐ] in.ܕ above line A, om. in. ܕ BC -- 200. ܚܘܫܒܗ] read (?) ܚܫܒܗ --207. ܠܐ] above line D — 214. ܙܒܢܗ] corr. from ܙܒܢܐ B — 217. ܕܒܫܢܝܢ] read ܕܒܫܢ̈ܝܢ as B(corr. from ܘܒܕܐ) CD

ܠܟܢ ܒܢܝܐ ܡܫܬܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܕܡ ܚܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܗܘ̇ ܠܥܡܐ ܒܥܒܕܐ ܒܠܒܗ ܘܫܕܐ ܒܥܢܬܐ.
ܐ ̱ ܘܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܗ̇, ܡܟܠܬܐ:
ܠܟܢ ܠܐ ܒܠܒܗܘܢ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܕܢܐܬܪ ܒܠܒܗܘܢ.
ܒܠܒܗܘܢ ܙܕܩ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܠܡܬܚܫܚܘ:
ܘܒܠܒܝܢ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܡܠܐ ܕܒܓܠܐ ܒܓܠܐ.
ܠܐ ܒܒܢܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܒܥܐ ܗ̱, ܐܝܟ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ:
ܚܝܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܒܐܬ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܡܠܐ ܕܕܝܢ.
ܘܦܪܫܢ ܕܠܒܪ ܒܡܦܪܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܡܬܒܕܩ ܒܗ:
ܘܗܘ̇ ܠܥܡܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܪܘܚܢܐ.
ܡܕܒܪ ܕܒܫܢ̈ܝܢ ܐܪܙܐ ܗܘ̇ ܕܒܢܝܐ ܕܚܠܦ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ:
ܐܦ ܫܘܫܦܢ ܠܚܘܫܒܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܘܫܦ ܫܘ̈ܒܝܢ.
ܕܡܢ ܗܘ̇ ܠܥܡܐ ܡܬܟܠܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܐ ܕܝ ܐܕܝܢ:
ܥܠ ܒܘܕܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܕܪܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܒܝܕ ܒܢܝܐ.
ܒܢ̈ܘܟܐ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܕܡܪܚܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܫܘܫܦܐ:
ܥܡܡ̈ܐ ܐܝܟ ̱ ܕܡܥܡܥܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܪܚܫܬ ܫܢ̈ܝܢ.
ܕܚܕܐ ܒܥܢܬܐ ܒܟܠ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܪܒܐ ܕܒܡܕ̈ܪܐ:
ܗ̇, ܡܟܠܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܪܢܫܬ ̱ ܝ ܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ.
ܠܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܚܬܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܟܘܠ ܐܪܙ ܦܘܪܩܢ:
ܘܡܟܠܬܗ ܡܬܕܪܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܗ̇, ܡܟܠܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܠܒܪ ܗܘܬ ܒܗܘܬ ܒܟܝܢ ܩܕܡ ܡܐܬܝܬܗ:
ܘܠܗ̇ ܗܘ ܡܫܒܪܐ ܒܒܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܐ ܘܒܒܢܝܐ ܕܒܓ̈ܠܐ.
ܗܕܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܘܒܢܝܢ ܒܝܕ ܦܘܠܚܢܗ:
ܘܡܚܘܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܬܘܩܢ̈ܐ ܕܒܠܒܐ ܘܕܠܒܪ.
ܐܠܐ ܠܟܗܢܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܘܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܕܘܟܪܐ:
ܘܥܠ ܦܡ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܩܘܕܫ ܩܘܕ̈ܫܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܠܝܠܐ ܘܚܫܟܐ.
ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܕܡ ܚܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܒܐܚܝܢ ܒܓܢܐ ܘܐܫܟܚܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܪܘܚܢܐ.
ܠܟܢܐ ܒܠܐ ܗܘܝܬ̈ ܒܐܦ̈ܝ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܩܘܕܫ ܩܘܕ̈ܫܝܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܒܟܠ ܗܘܝܬ̈ ܡܬܟܢܫܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܥܒ̈ܢܝܬܐ.
ܠܟܢ ܐܦ ܒܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܒܟܠ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܡܝܢܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܟܢܐ ܕܒܟܠ ܗܘܐ. ܠܟܢ ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܒܥܡܗ.

---

221. ܐܪܙܐ] ܐܪܙܗ̇ BCD — 226. ܐܚܪܢܐ] before corr. repeated (dit.) B | ܘܡܠܐ] ܕܡܠܐ BCD — 240. ܒܒܢܝܢܐ] add. sey. BCD — 241. ܡܫܡܫܝܢ] ̱ above line B — 243. ܐܠܐ] add. in. ܘ BCD

* f. 210r

* ܘܦܪܫܢ ܗܘ̇ ܕܒܕܡ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܡܬܒܕܩ ܒܗ:
ܘܩܘܕܫ ܩܘܕ̈ܫܝܢ ܡܫܠܡ ܡܠܬ̈ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܒܚܐ.
ܟܠܗ ܒܟܠܗ ܒܪܘܪܬܐ ܕܫܢ̈ܝܢ ܡܒܕܪ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܒܥܡܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܘܗܝ, ܫܪܪܐ ܕܕܝܢ.
ܠܕܝܢܗ ܪܒܐ ܪ ̱ ܠܓܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܩܘܠ ܘܗܪܐ ܕܗܦ̈ܟܝܢ:
ܘܗܫܐ ܕܕܝܢ ܠܟܢ ܒܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܢܝܫܘܪ ̱ ܒܗ.
ܚܝ̣, ܚܪܝܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܢܗܪܐ ܢܗܝܪܘܬܗ:
ܕܪܕܦܗ ܠܫܡܫܐ ܕܡܬܚܪܘܬܐ ܘܛܠܠܗ ܘܐܘܦ.
ܐܪܐ ܗܟܠܐ ܫܡܘܠ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܡܢ ܪܚܝܩ:
ܘܚܝ̣, ܒܠܒܐ ܕܪ̈ܕܐ ܒܢܗܪܐ ܕܒܪܘܪܬܗ.
ܐܪܐ ܫܛܝܪܐ ܫܘܬ ܡܢ ܪܘܡܐ ܕܫܪܝܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܫܘܪ ܒܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܫܐ ܠܗ ܠܫܡܫܐ ܕܐܫܠܝܬ.
ܟܠܗ̇ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܢܐ ܫܘܒܚܗ ܕܠܐ ܫܟܝܢܬܐ:
ܘܐܪܒܥ ܦܢ̈ܝܢ ܒܓܠܝܢ ܠܫܡܗ ܟܠܝܠ ܪܒܘܬܐ.
ܒܠܗܘܢ ̱ ܒܐܬ̈ܪܐ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܡܐܬܝܬܗ ܡܬܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܘܗܦܟܝ̣, ܪܘܚܐ ܥܠ ܓܠܝܢܗ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܓܠܝܢܗ ܡܬܓܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܘܕܝܢ̈ܗܘ ̱:
ܘܡܠܐ̈ܟܐ ܟܕ ܠܗ ܡܬܦܝܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܥܘܠܝ̈ܢܗܘ ̱.
ܒܪܘܬ ܕܝ ܠܗ ܝܗܒ ܢܡܘܣܐ ܘܠܐܬ̈ܪܗ:
ܘܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܐܦܠܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܡܫܬܡܥ ܗܘܐ.
ܒܥܡܐ ܕܠܗ ܡܬܦܪܫ ܗܘܐ ܒܪܘܚ ܓܠܝ̈ܢܐ:
ܐܦ ܓܠܝ̈ܢܐ ܥܠ ܓܠܝܢܗ ܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܠܗ ܦܫܝܛ ܗܘܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܩܕܡ ܗܘ̇ ܓܒܝܐ:
ܐܦ ܗܘ ܓܒܝܐ ܕܒܬ ܠܗ ܡܟܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ.
ܒܕܡ ܚܘ̈ܬܐ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܕܕܡܗ ܡܬܒܕܩ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܬܒܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܘ ܡܚܫܟܐ ܗܘܐ.
ܒܡܘܠܝ ܒܐܪ̈ܐ ܫܪܪ ܡܐܬܝܬܗ ܡܫܬܪܪ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܒܕܒܢ̈ܘܗ ̱ ܫܥܗ ܘܡܒܘܬܗ ܡܬܠܝ ܢ ܗܘܐ.
ܠܗ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ̇ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܐ:
ܘܦܗܘ̇ܕ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܕܬܡܢ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܒܐܪܙ ܓܠܝܢܗ.
ܐܪܙ ܓܠܝܢܗ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ [ܘܒܢܝܢܐ]:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܒܥܡܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܝܕ [ܫܘܒܚܐ].

---

252. ܩܘܕ̈ܫܝܢ] corr. from ܩܘܕܫܐ B, ܩܘܕ̈ܫܐ D — 263. ܫܘܒܚܗ] corr. from ܫܘܒܗ B — 275. ܪܘܫܡܐ] first ܫ repeated above line — 281. [ܘܒܢܝܢܐ]] blank space of c. 1.5 stiches AI, corr. from ܡܫܒܚܐ ܗܘ and foll. by a blank space of c. 1 stich B, read as CD — 282. [ܫܘܒܚܐ]] blank space of 1 word AI, read as BCD

ܠܗ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܠܒܫܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ:
ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܢܐܬܐ ܘܢܫܡܫ ܐܗܪܘܢ ܒܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ.
ܠܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܒܢܘܗ ܡܬܐܟܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܡܬܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܢܕܒܚ ܩܘܪܒܢܗ ܚܛܐ ܘܢܦܘܩ ܐܗܪܘܢ.
ܐܡܪܐ ܕܒܚܝܘܗ ܡܩܪܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܕܚܝܠܘܬܗ:
ܘܠܒ ܡܢ ܪܡܫܐ ܡܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܦܘܡ ܐܟܠܘ̈ܗܝ،
ܒܐܘܟܠܗ ܕܚܛܝܐ ܐܘܟܠܐ ܕܦܓܪܗ ܡܬܟܒܫ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܒܕܡܗ ܥܓܠܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܫܪܐ ܡܬܦܩܕ ܗܘܐ.
ܪܘܡܐ ܕܕܡܗ ܢܛܪܗ ܠܡܕܒܚܐ ܡܢ ܢܟ̈ܝܠܐ:
ܘܐܢ ܕܡ ܚܛܝܐ ܚܡܝܡ ܕܢܛܪ ܕܡܐ ܕܚܠܠܐ.
ܒܕܡ ܡܠܠܐ ܚܠܦ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܘܩ ܠܒܐ ܠܐܪܥܐ:
ܘܓܒܪ ܚܛܝܐ ܕܕܪܘܫ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܩܕܡ ܡܬܬܐܬܗ.
ܒܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܦܓܪܗ ܡܟܪܙ ܗܘܐ ܟܠ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܬܩܢ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܘܦܪܝܫ، ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܩܕܫ ܩܘܕܫ̈ܐ.
ܟܐܪܙ ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܦܓܪܗ ܘܢܦܫܗ ܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ:
ܘܦܓܪܢܝܬܐ ܘܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܫ ܗܘܐ.
ܦܓܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܗܢ̈ܝܢ ܗܘ̈ܝ ܒܗ:
ܠܦܘܬ ܕܟܬܝܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܒܘܫܢ ܐܢܘܢ، * * f. 210v
ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܐܢ̈ܫܐ.
ܠܠܒܫܝܢ ܥܒܕܘ ܡܫܒܚ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܡܕܒܚܐ ܠܥܠܡ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܐܘܢܩܝܐ ܐܣܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܣܦܪܐ ܕܥܠܘܗܝ،
ܠܥܒܕܐ ܕܢܚܫܗ ܬܐܣܪ ܗܘܐ ܢܚܫܐ ܕܢܛܪܬܗ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܒܡܒܒܐ ܢܫܒ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܒܦܐܝܬ ܢܗܘܪܗ.
ܠܦܫܐ ܬܡܘܢܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܘܩܘܕܫ ܩܘܕܫ̈ܐ:
ܘܠܦܘܬ ܚܠܦܐ ܢܦܩ ܗܘܐ ܟܐܪܚܐ ܠܐܘܪܚ ܦܢܝܢ.
ܕܗܘܬ ܫܒܒܐ ܡܚܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ ܡܢܪܬ ܫܒ̈ܠܐ:
ܘܒܢܗܝܪܘܗ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܕܩ̈ܐ ܕܕܒ̈ܢܝܐ.
ܫܒܒܐ ܒܢܘܗܪܗ ܡܒܛܠ ܦܐܪ̈ܐ ܘܡܚܒܪܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܢܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܦ ܗ، ܒܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܚܠܡܐ ܕܬܕܝܪ.
ܒܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܬܩܒܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܗ، ܘܡܙܪ ܚܘܒܗ:
ܠܦܘܬ ܕܐܦ ܫܡܫܐ ܒܡܘܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܪܘܚܗ.
ܗܟܢ ܕܡܐ ܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܐܕܡ ܒܪ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ:

ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܫܡܫ ܠܡܕܒܚܗ ܠܒ ܡܢ ܗܡܢ.
ܚܕ، ܠܡ ܘܚܕܐ ܒܐܣܟܝܡ ܕܘܡܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܪܝܫ ܩܘܕܡܝܗܘܢ.
ܘܗܘ ܬܘܪܐ ܕܒܗ ܠܘܬ ܡܕܡ ܪܒܝ ܒܡܕܡ.
ܠܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܕܘܡܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܪ ܠܗ ܐܡܪܐ ܒܛܘܪܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܬܚܙܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܠܗ ܕܘܡܝܐ.
ܒܗܘܢܐ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܒܬܗ ܡܟܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܪܘܚܐܝܬ:
ܘܬܘܪܐ ܡܠܠܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܒܩܘ̈ܕܡܐ ܘܫܡܠܝ ܒܪ̈ ܓܒܐ.
ܚܙܬܐ ܕܬܘܪܐ ܚܙܐ ܚܙܝܐ ܕܡܬܬܪ̈ܐ:
ܘܪܟܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܒ ܡܢ ܬܪܒܝܬܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܒܝܐ.
ܦܬ̈ܟܪܐ ܗܘ̈ܝ، ܠܒ ܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܗ ܕܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܘܒܗܝܢ:
ܘܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܫܠܝܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܦܘܠܚ̈ܢܗ،
ܐܝܟ ܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܓܒܪ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܦܘܠܚ̈ܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܓܒ̈ܪܐ ܠܒܫܡܗ.
ܒܠܒܫܐ ܒܒܕܗ ܠܦܘܬ ܠܒܫ̈ܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܒܛܘܪܐ:
ܘܫܬܐܝܬ ܪܥܡ ܕܡܚܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܥܘܠܦܐ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܚܙܬ ܠܡ ܕܡܬܬܢ ܒܪ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܘܕܪܐ ܕܡܚܢܗ ܠܗܘ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܬܚܘ، ܠܟ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܢܗܪ ܫܡܟܐ ܕܟܕܢ ܪܘܚܐ ܒܡܠ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܡܫܡܫ ܒܗܘܢ ܠܓܘܢܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܡ ܒܠܒ̈ܐ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܕܪܫܬ ܒܗ ܐܪ̈ܒܝܐ:
ܘܠܟ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܕܚܠܠ ܒܡܟ ܕܪܫܗ ܒܦܘܡܟ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܫܪܝܪ ܫܡ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ ܒܐܪܥܐ:
ܕܦܪܫ ܘ ܠܟ ܠܡܫܪܝܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܪܗܛܬ ܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܟ ܟܠܠ ܠܥܡܐ:
ܕܒܪܬ ܒܠܫ̈ܢܐ ܘܬܢܫܬ ܠܦܘܡܐ ܕܬܬܡ ܒܠܫ̈ܢܐ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܟܐ ܡܠܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܒܪܐ ܠܡܚܝܐ ܕܒܫ̈ܝܢ:
ܕܐܘܬ ܘܒܥ̈ܘܗܝ، ܠܡܬܟܡܘ ܒܟܠܐ ܚܙܬܐ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܬܚܗ ܒܡܠܬܟ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܥܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܬ̈ܟܐ:
ܕܢܠܦ ܡܬ̈ܟܐ ܡܠܝܬܗ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܬ ܪܘܚܐ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܥܡܪ ܬܪ ܠܡ ܪܘܚܐ ܒܦܘܡܟ:
ܕܐܝܟ ܠܦܘܡܗ ܦܫܛܬ ܐܪ̈ܘܗܝ، ܒܗܬ ܐܪ̈ܒܝܐ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܗܪܐ ܒܫܠܐ ܕܫܠ ܘܡܕܪ ܢܦܫܟ:

---

320. ܒܪ̈ ܓܒܐ] illegible in text corr. in marg. — 341. ܒܡܠܬܟ] ܟ add. in 2nd hand

ܕܗܘܘ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܘܒܪܗ̇ ܒܦܘܩܕܢ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܣܒܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܫܪ، ܒܝܢ ܚܝܠ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ:
ܘܒܦܘܩܕܢܗ ܫܟܠܠܗ ܡܠܬܗ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܚܕ̈ܬܐ.
ܟܕ ܠܐ ܢܦܩܝܢ ܐܠܗ ܐܪܒܥܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܒܥܝܬ:
ܕܒܢܝܗ̇ ܕܡܠܬܗ ܡܢܗ ܠܒܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ.
ܦܐܐ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܐܫܬܡܗ ܠܗ ܒܪ * ܡܫܟܢܬܐ: * f. 211r
ܘܟܠ ܫܠܡܬ ܠܗ̇ ܒܢܝ: ܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝ ܐܕܝܢ.
ܒܫܡܐ ܫܟܝܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܗ ܥܡ ܐܠܗܐ:
ܘܒܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ ܗ̤ܘܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܢܦܩܬ ܢܒܝܐ ܪܒܐ.
ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܡܠ̈ܝܗܝܢ ܗ̤ܘܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܒܥܝܬ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܒܢܝ ܬܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܬ ܠܒܪܬ.
ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܢܦܩܬ ܢܒܝܐ ܪܒܐ ܫܟܠܠ ܡܠ̈ܝܗܝܢ:
ܘܠܟܠܗ ܠܝ ܘܦܩ ܒܢ ܒܠܒܟܐ ܕܕܡܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܕܡ̈ܘܗܝ،
ܡܠܠܬܗ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܙܘܥܐ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܫܬܝܩܐ:
ܘܠܗ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܠܐܡܬܐ، ܢܐܬܐ ܢܬܕܡ ܐܝܟ
ܒܗ ܣܟܪ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܬܘܡܝܗ ܕܡܫܡܫ ܐܒܗܐ:
ܕܒܬܪ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܒܗܐ ܠܚܝܠ ܐܬܘܬܐ.
ܒܡܠܐ ܕܒܗܐ ܥܒܕ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܠܥܡ ܒܝܬܐ:
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡ ܡܫܬܡܫ ܒܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬ.
ܒܡܩܕܫܐ ܕܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܚܕܪ ܒܡܫܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܢܬܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܡܬܩܕܫ ܡܢ ܙܘܥܐ ܘܡܢ ܦܘܪ̈ܩܢܐ.
ܒܠܗ̇ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܫܘܪܪܐ ܒܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܠܡܬܩܢܘܬܗ̇:
ܘܡܣܒܪܢܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܢܦܫܐ ܐܠܗܐ.
ܡܩܕܫܐ ܗܘ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܘܡܩܕܫ ܡܩܕ̈ܫܐ ܘܟܕ ܢܦܫܗ:
ܘܒܕܡܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܡܩܕܫܐ ܘܡܩܕܫ ܡܩܕ̈ܫܐ.
ܡܩܕܫܐ ܘܡܩܕܫܐ ܡܬܒܢܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫ ܐܒܗܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ ܒܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ.
ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܦܘܪܩܢܬܐ ܡܬܒܕܩܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܘܒܠܒܢܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܒܫܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܪܪܐ ܗܘܬ.
ܒܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܒܪܝܬܐ:
ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܡܫܟ̈ܢܐ.
ܒܬܘܩܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܬܘܩܢܗ ܡܫܡܫܐ ܠܗܘ ܬܘܩܢܐ:
ܬܘ ܢܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܬܘܩܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܗ̤ܘܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ.

---

351. ܦܐܐ] before corr. foll. by ܗܘܐ B — 358. ܠܝ ܘܦܩ ܒܢ] read ܠܡܦܩ ܒܢ as BCD — 375. before corr. stich foll. by stich 374 (dit.) C

Homily VI

On the Brazen Serpent

Sigla of Manuscripts

A	= London, British Library, Oriental 5463
B	= Leningrad, The Institute of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5
C	= London, British Library, Oriental 9367
D	= Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55
E	= Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 594
F	= (Olim) Diyarbakır, Chaldean Archbishopric, 71
G	= London, British Library, Oriental 9363c
I	= Teheran, Neesan 1

ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒܪ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܢ ܘܬܫܥܐ. ܕܥܠ ܫܒܘܥܐ
ܕܚܫܐ. ܘܠܝܬ ܠܡܫܠܡܘܬܐ.

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܫܘܒܚܐ ܐܩܝܡ ܩܝܡܐ ܥܡ ܐܒܪܗܡ:
ܘܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܠܗ ܕܢܦܘܩ ܙܪܥܗ ܡܢ ܥܒܕܘܬܐ.
ܥܒܕܐ ܥܬܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܙܪܥܗ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܡܨܪܝܢ:
ܘܦܪܩ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܫܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܚܝܠ ܕܪܥܗ.
ܚܝܠ ܪܚܡܘܬܗ * ܗܘ ܕܡܚܪܪ ܠܗ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ:
ܘܒܪ ܠܗ ܓܒܝܢ ܥܡܐ ܓܒܝ ܥܡܗ ܓܢܒ. ܐܒܪܗܡ.
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܘܒܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܐܦܩ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܐ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ:
ܘܕܒܪ ܡܢܗܠ ܐܢܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܚܘܪܒܐ ܕܫܠܝܐ.
ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܚܘܪܒܐ ܐܥܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܗܢܢ ܥܢܢܐ:
ܕܒܗ ܚܘܪܒܐ ܢܦܩ ܚܘܪܒܐ ܕܐ̈ܒܗܝܗܘܢ.
ܠܟܠܬ ܥܡܐ ܐܥܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܚܘܪܒܐ ܕܠܒܪ:
ܕܕܡ ܢܬܒܥܘܢ ܡܢ ܥܡܐ ܕܥܒܕܘܬܐ.
ܕܐܝܟ ܕܥܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܬܚܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܬܐ:
ܘܕܒܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐܬܪܐ ܕܡܒܥܒܥ ܡܢ ܐܘܪܚܬܐ.
ܒܚܘܠܦ ܐܬܪܐ ܦܓܪ ܕܡܫܠܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܗܘܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܠܗ ܒܪ ܦܠܚܘܬܗ ܚܐܪܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܚܘܪܒܐ ܘܥܢܢܐ.
ܥܒܕܐ ܒܥܢܢܐ ܚܒܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܕܠܐ ܦܐܝܢ:
ܘܠܐ ܝܗܒ ܕܒܗ ܒܕܘܒܪܐ ܦܐܝܐ ܕܝܗܒ، ܐܢܘܢ.
ܟܡܦܪܬܐ ܪ ܠܚܫܘ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܬ ܠܬܚܝܬܗܘܢ:
ܘܐܣܩ ܚܝܠܐ ܘܠܒܘܬܐ ܕܕܡ ܢܬܝܠܦܘܢ.
ܒܚܝܠܐ ܘܗܠܐ، ܬܘܣܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܠܐ ܠܐܣܪ:
ܘܡܢ ܦܪܝܫܐ ܐܚܪ، ܥܡܐ ܘܐܘܣܦ ܐܢܘܢ.
ܥܡܐ ܕܦܠܚܐ ܦܬܚ ܐܣܪ ܡܥܡܕܐ ܥܠ ܪ̈ܚܡܘܗܝ:
ܘܒܕܒܪܬ ܡܢܬܐ ܦܩܕ ܥܒܕܐ ܕܢܠܥܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ.
ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗܬ ܡܥܠܢܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ:

* f. 200r

Title. ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒܪ ܕܝܠܗ BCD, ܕܥܠ ܫܒܘܥܐ ܕܚܫܐ. ܘܠܝܬ ܠܡܫܠܡܘܬܐ. ܡܐܡܪܐ. ܠܗ. ܕܥܠ ܫܒܘܥܐ ܕܚܫܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܠܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܡܬܦܪܫܐ ܒܥܕܢܐ ܕܡܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ، ܘ ܠܝܬܐ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܚܫܐ ܕܝܬܒ. ܘܡܢ. ܐܝܬ E(om. ܠܗ) FG — 3. ܕܐܪܥܐ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܠܙܪܥܗ] ܙܪܥܗ EFG — 5. ܠܐ] ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ F — 6. ܓܒܝ] ܠܓܒܪܐ EF | ܓܒܝ] add. in. ܕ EFG — 7. ܐ] ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܐ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ F — 9. ܕܚܘܪܒܐ] om. ܕ EF | ܐܥܒܪ] ܐܥܒܪܘ FG, ܠܥܒܪܘ ܐ E — 11. ܐܥܒܪ] ܐܥܒܪܘ EFG — 13. ܡܬܬܚܝܢ] ܡܬܬܚܝܢܢ EFG — 16. read ܠܗ ܒܪ ܦܠܚܘܬܗ ܠܦܠܚܘܬܗ ܦܠܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ ܒܕ ܒܗ ܕܘܒܪܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ; ܘ ܦܠܚܘܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܚܐܪܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܚܘܪܒܐ ܘܥܢܢܐ. as EFG — 20. ܢܬܝܠܦܘܢ] ܢܬܝܠܦܘܢ EFG

ܘܒܗ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܢܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܫܡܫܬܐ.
ܒܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܬܒܣܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܝܢ̈ܝ ܢܦܫܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܠܒܪ ܦܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܐ ܦܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܦܐܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܢܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܐ ܦܓܪܐ:
ܘܝܬܝܪ ܡܢܗ ܦܐܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܝ ܢܦܫܐ.
ܦܓܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܡܬܒܣܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܝܢ:
ܘܟܕ ܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ.
ܒܥܝܢܐ ܓܪܒܐ ܫܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܬܡܢ ܒܪ ܕܫܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܘܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܪܐ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܚܘܪܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܚܘܪܐ ܒܥܝܢܗ ܡܚܣܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܚܘܪܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ:
ܕܗܘ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܘܗܢܘܢ ܠܐ ܬܚܙܘܢ ܡܢ ܒܝ̈ܫܬܐ.
ܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܡܢܘ ܕܢܝܪ ܒܟܠܐ ܒܓܠܝܗ:
ܘܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܐܡܠܟ ܚܘܝܐ ܟܠ ܒܝܫܘܬܗ.
ܪܓܒ ܗܘܐ ܚܣܝܢܗ ܘܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܪ̈ܫܐ ܠܚܣܝܢܗ:
ܘܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܚܝܣ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܡܚܐ ܠܚܣܝܢܘܬܗ.
ܦܚܗܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܚܬ ܓܘܫܐ ܕܒܚܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܗ:
ܘܟܕ ܢܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܦܘܬ ܢܚܫܗ.
ܕܠܐ ܢܚܫܐ ܡܙܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܘܙܒܢܗ ܕܐܟܘܬ:
ܘܠܐ ܦܐܫ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܠ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܢܟ̈ܬܐ.
ܠܠܘܡܚܐ ܐܪܐ ܠܠܘܚܒ ܠܠܘ̈ܚܐ ܠܠܚܘܒ ܕܒܗܘܢ:
ܘܕܚܝܐ ܚܘܪܐ ܦܢܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ.
ܚܝ̈ܐ ܒܥܝܢܐ ܚܙܝ ܗܘܝ ܕܢܚܙܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܫܡܘܥܬܗ ܕܪܦܬܗ ܠܚܝܘܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܡ.
ܥܠ ܓܒܘܪܐ ܐܚܝܢܐ ܠܝ ܓܒܐ ܕܚܙܪ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܪܓܠܐ ܡܫܟܐ ܦܬܚܗ ܠܦܘܡܗ ܠܡܬܒܥܘ.
ܡܚܬ ܫܝ ܐܪܐ ܬܒܥܬܗ ܠܡܚܘܝܐ ܕܡܚܬ ܓܘܫܐ:
ܘܡܚܘܐ ܓܘܫܐ ܠܡܚܒܠܘ ܠܚܠܠܬܐ.
ܫܠܝܛܬܐ ܦܬܚܬ ܬܪܥ ܦܘܡܗ ܡܢܘ ܥܬ̈ܝܕܐ:
ܘܐܠܦܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܫܬܐܠܘ ܥܠ ܡ̈ܠܠܐ.
ܒܛܠܐ ܠܗ ܚܟܡܐ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܕܝܬܪܐ ܡܢܥܐ:
ܘܐܢܪܝ ܡܕܝܪܐ ܠܚܘܫܬܐ ܕܒܟܬܘܒܝܗ.

---

27. ܗܘܘ] above line B — 28. ܘܠܐ ܦܐܝܢ] masc. AI, fem. BCD, ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܦܐܝܢ (masc.) EFG — 29. ܦܐܐ] ܦܐ F — 30. ܦܐܐ] ܦܐܝܐ EG | ܗܘܐ] om. EFG — 31. ܦܓܪܐ] add. in. ܒ EG — 32. ܘܠܐ] om. in. ܘ EFG — 34. ܕܡܒܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ] ܕܡܒܢܝܗܘܢ EFG — 36. ܬܚܙܘܢ] read ܬܚܙܘ as BCDEFG — 41. ܗܘܬ ܕܒܚܪܐ] read ܕܒܚܪ ܗܘܐ as EFG — 42. ܗܘܐ] before corr. prec. by ܠܐ (inv.) F | ܘܠܐ] om. ܘ DEFG — 48. ܫܡܘܥܬܗ] read ܫܡܘܥܬܐ as EFG — 49. ܠܝ ܓܒܐ] read ܠܓܘܫܐ as BCD, ܓܘܫܐ EFG — 50. ܠܦܘܡܗ] om. ܠ I | ܠܡܬܒܥܘ] read ܠܡܒܥܘ as BCDEFG — 52. ܓܘܫܐ] ܫܪܫܐ EF(corr. from ܓܪܫܐ) G — 53. ܥܬ̈ܝܕܐ] om. sey. BCD — 56. ܡܕܝܪܐ] ܡܕܪܐ EG

ܟܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܫܡܗ ܒܬܟܠܐ ܠܒܢܝ ܚܪ̈ܫܐ:
ܕܢܘܒܕ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܬܚܫܒ̈ܢܐ * ܚܝܠ ܡܪܘܬܗ. * f. 200v
ܚܝܠܗ ܢܨܚ ܠܚܘܫܬܐ ܠܐ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ:
ܘܥܠܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܐܟܢܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܨܒܐ ܗܘ.
ܨܒܐ ܗܘ ܘܐܪܡܝ ܠܛܠܡܐ ܕܥܬܝܕܐ ܥܠ ܦܘܡ̈ܗܘܢ:
ܘܦܢܐ ܨܒܐ ܗܘ ܘܡܛܪܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܡܒܥܬܘ.
ܠܘ ܗܘ ܥܒܕܬ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܥܒܕܬ:
ܠܐ ܥܒܕܬܐ ܕܚܟܡܐ ܡܢ ܬܗ ܠܡܬܚܫܠܘ.
ܥܒܝܕܬ ܚܟܡܐ ܚܝܐ ܗܘ ܙܢܪܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܟܠܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܥܒܕܬ ܠܗ ܠܡܬܒܣܡܘ ܒܥܒܝܕܘܬܗ.
ܥܘܝܠܐ ܕܚܟܡܐ ܚܝܐ ܒܥܒܝܕܬܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܡܘܗܒ ܐܘܟܠܐ ܠܢ̈ܫܐ ܫܒܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܠܬܐ.
ܕܠܐ ܒܚܝܠܗ ܦܟܐ ܫܬܩܐ ܠܚܠܠܬܐ:
ܕܚܘܪ ܟܕ ܠܘ ܟܕ ܐܟܠܐ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܘܫܪܝ.
ܚܝܠܐ ܕܟܝܢܝ ܟܠܝ ܡܢ ܕܐܟܠܐ ܠܦܘܫܩܬܗ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܦܘܫܩܗܝ ܫܪܝ ܕܐܬܪܝ ܠܠܐ ܡܕܒܪ.
ܘܡܢ ܕܡܚܬܐ ܠܓܙ ܗܘܐ ܓܘܫܐ ܥܠ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ:
ܘܐܪܝ ܡܫܕܪܐ ܚܟܐܪܝ ܡܪܬܗ ܒܡܙܕܪܝ ܚܕܟܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܩܘܡܪܐ ܥܛܠܘ ܡܪܫܐ ܠܥܝܢ̈ܝܗܘܢ:
ܘܕܠܐ ܫܘܫ ܪ ܓܒܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܚ̈ܝܝ ܢܦܫܐ.
ܡܪܟܐ ܡܥܒܐ ܒܕܝܘ ܒܡ ܦܓܪܐ ܘܒܡ ܪܓܫܐ:
ܘܠܫܘ ܦܠܠܗܝ ܘܠܐܫܝܢ ܓܪܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܓܘ ܒܣܪܗ.
ܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ ܬܟܒ ܥܬܝ̈ܩܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܠܐ:
ܘܦܬܚܘ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܓܒܘܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܟܘܪܐ.
ܗܘ ܟܘܪܐ ܐܠܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܠܐ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ:
ܠܡܬܢܡܘܢ ܒܝܬܐ ܕܝ ܒܪܗ ܡܢ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ.
ܩܛܠ ܦܪܫ ܗܘܘ ܠܐ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ ܠܡܦܪܫ ܩܛܠ:
ܘܛܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܦܪܫܝܢ ܡܢܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܦܘܪܫܢܗܘܢ.
ܒܦܪܘܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܚܡܗ ܠܚܟܡܐ ܚܝܠ ܐܪܝܐ:
ܘܒܡܪܬܗܘܢ ܐܪܝܗ ܠܡܪܬܐ ܕܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܡܪܬܐ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܦܬܓܡܬܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ:

---

58. ܡܪܘܬܗ] ܡܪܝܘܬܗ EG — 61. ܠܛܠܡܐ] om. ܠ EFG — 66. ܘܠܐ] ܕܠܐ BCD — 68. ܘܡܘܗܒ ܠܗ ܒܗ ܘܡܘܗܒ ܐܘܟܠܐ ܠܢ̈ܫܐ ܫܒܠܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܠܬܐ ܡܠܠ ܚܟܡܗ ܕܠܐ ܡܢܐ ܟܕ ܦܪܫܬ ܘܫܪܝ ܕܐܬܪܝ ܠܠܐ ܡܕܒܪ: ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܟܠܬܐ EFG — 69. ܕܠܐ ܒܚܝܠܗ] ܕܒܚܝܠܗ EFG — 71. ܠܦܘܫܩܬܗ] ܠܦܘܫܩܬܗܝ EFG — 72. ܦܘܫܩܗܝ] read ܦܘܫܩܗ as BCDEFG | ܡܕܒܪ] ܡܕܒܪܗ EFG — 75. ܩܘܡܪܐ] add. sey. BCD | ܡܪܫܐ] ܡܪ̈ܫܐ EFG — 83. ܩܛܠ] ܫܒܩ EG

ܘܦܩܕܗ̇ ܠܟܠܗ ܒܡܚܘܬܐ ܕܢܚܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܚܘܬܗܘܢ.
ܠܡܚܘܬܐ ܒܡܚܘܬܐ ܦܩܕܗ ܚܠܡܗ ܫܢܝܐܝܬ:
ܘܡܚܘܬܗ̇ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܕܢܚܫܬܐ ܠܡܚܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܠܚܘܝܐ ܪܒܐ ܗܘ، ܒܕܡܘܬ ܕܕܠܐ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܗܘ:
ܘܒܬܠܝܠܘܬܗ ܚܘܝ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܕܟܠܟܠ ܚܝܪܐ.
ܐܣܛܠܐ ܕܪܘ ܒܠܐ ܐܘܟܡ. ܕܒܗܪ ܟܦܪ ܫܡܫܐ:
ܘܚܠܦ ܐܝܟܐ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܢܟܬ ܠܡܬܢܟܬܢܐ.
ܠܢܟ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܟܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܢܟܬ̈ܗ، ܚܝܝ ܢܚ̈ܫܐ ܕܢܟܬܗܘܢ ܡܢܗ.
ܠܡܬܠܡܕ̈ܐ ܟܠܗ؛ ܕܫܒܩ ܐܫܠܡ ܐܢܘܢ:
ܕܒܢܝܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܟܬ ܠܟܐ ܕܡܢ̈ ܚܘܠܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܬܚܘ̈ܒܐ ܡܬܚܪܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܟܠܗ ܡܫܪܝܬܐ:
ܘܡܬܩܛܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܬܪ ܚܘܠܐ ܕܐܡܟܐ ܡܫܟܚܬ.
ܐܝܟ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ ܡܬܩܛܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܚܪ̈ܒ ܚܘܠܐ:
ܕܪ ܠܚܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܠܚܘ̈ܬܗܘܢ ܬܟܝܒ ܐܢܫܐ.
ܚܕ ܚ̈ܝܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܫܦܝܘ ܠܡܩܡ ܩܕܡ ܬܟ̈ܒܬܐ:
ܘܩܦܘ ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܚܝܘ ܠܐ ܬܟܒ.
ܚܘ ܚܝܐ ܠܗ ܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܚܝܐ:
ܘܦܪܐ ܠܒܢܘܗܝ ܘܐܠܦܗ ܕܢܦܩ ܡܢܐ ܠܚܝܘ.
ܚܕ ܠܡ ܚܝܐ ܐܦܪ ܡܪܝܐ ܠܒܫܝܐ ܒܒܢܘܗܝ:
ܘܫܢܝܘܗܝ، ܠܐܬܐ ܘܠܒܘܢܝܐ ܕܢܐܫܐ ܠܒܫܐ.
ܚܝܐ ܪܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܪܘܒܒܐ * ܕܚܘ̈ܬܐ:
ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܢܟܐ ܟܠܗ ܒܟܠܗ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܚܝܐ.
ܚܝܐ ܡܬܝܬܐ ܒܒܪ ܒܐܣܝܘܬܐ ܕܢܟܬܐ ܠܡܩܫܬܐ:
ܕܒܚܠܘܬܗ ܢܦܠܘ ܡܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܚܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܓܠܝܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܟܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܟܠܠ ܒܒܝܬܗ:
ܘܗܝܡܢ ܘܐܫܪ ܘܐܬܩܢ ܘܓܒܪ ܚܝܐ ܫܡܝܢܐ.
ܢܓܠ ܡܠܠܐ ܕܒܡܘܬܐ ܕܚܫܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܫܝܢܐ:
ܘܐܪܝܡ ܘܬܠܝܗ، ܒܟܠܗ ܡܫܪܝܬܐ ܕܫܦܝܪ ܚܒܠܐ.
ܒܟܠ ܚܕ ܒܚܢܐ ܬܠܝܗ ܠܕܡܘܬܐ ܡܫܝܚܝܬܐ:
ܕܚܝܘܪܘ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܒܬܢܐ ܘܢܚܒܘܢ ܚܠܬܗ.

* f. 201r

---

88. ܘܦܩܕܗ̇] ܘܦܩܕܕܗ̇ E — 89. ܦܩܕܗ] ܦܩܕܗ̇ G — 90. ܘܡܚܘܬܗ̇] read ܘܡܚܘܬ as BCDEFG | ܠܡܚܘܬ repeated before corr. (dit.) D — 93. ܐܣܛܠܐ] add. sey. D, ܐܣܛܠ̈ܐ EG | ܕܪܘ ܒܠܐ] ܕܪܘܒܗ (dit.?) EFG — 94. ܢܟܬ] ܘܢܟܬ EFG — 104. ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ] om. sey. D — 105. ܒܚܫܘܟܐ] ܒܚܫܘܟܗ EFG — 108. ܕܢܐܫܐ ܠܒܫܐ] ܒܟܠ ܚܕ ܒܚܢܐ EFG — 111. ܒܐܣܝܘܬܐ] ܒܐܣܝܘܬܗ CDEFG — 112. ܡܪ̈ܬܐ] corr. from ܡܪܬܬܐ E — 115. ܕܚܫܝܐ] ܕܚܪܫܐ EFG — 118. ܡܬܚܒܬܢܐ] ܡܬܚܒܬܢܝܐ EFG

ܒܘܟ̈ܪܐ ܕܗܘܕܥܐ ܡܢ ܒ ܗܦܟܗ ܠܫܡ ܚܘܝܬܐ:
ܘܐܦܩ ܡܢ ܐܕܢܗ، ܚܙܐ ܕܟܠܫ ܕܢܬܟܡܘܢ ܒܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܡܚܘܫܬܐ ܡܒܒܗ ܒܫܩܐ ܩܕܡ ܚܒ̈ܫܘܗܝ:
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܟܠܗ ܚܘܬܗ ܠܦܟܪܐ ܘܠܒܝܫܐ.
ܚܘܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܗܘ، ܡܒܫܐ ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܒܒܗ:
ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܚܘܬܐ ܗܘ، ܐܝܟ ܠܡܬܐܣܝܘ.
ܚܘܪܘ ܘܐܬܐܣܝܘ ܗܕܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܡܬܒܪܝܐ ܗܘܬ:
ܘܬܗܪܘ ܘܬܡܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܚܕ ܚܘܬܐ ܕܬܐܣܐ.
ܒܕ ܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܡܟܘ ܡܕܡܟܬ ܒܪ ܐܬܟܡܘ:
ܒܕܡܟܐ ܕܠܒܘ ܒܕ ܢܫܟܐ ܘܐܟܢ ܗܡܟܘ.
ܒܕ ܢܫܟܐ ܡܢ ܒܡܢܟܐ ܠܡܬܚܒܟܘ:
ܘܗܡܟܘ ܕܡܢ ܐ ܚܪܫܐ ܠܡܟܠܐ ܡܪܬ ܚܫܟܐ.
ܒܕ ܗܡܟ̈ܪܐ ܡܠܟܘ ܗܡܟܪܐ ܕܚܘܝܐ ܚܫܟܐ:
ܘܫܪܘ ܕܡܫܝ ܠܚܘܬܐ ܒܚܠܐ ܕܡܢܗ.
ܚܘ ܕܚܬܗ ܡܫܠܚܐ ܦܘܟܐ ܕܐܘܠܝ ܢܬܗܘܢ:
ܘܒܗܪܘ ܘܐܗܘܠ ܒܡܟܐܪ̈ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܗܢܬܗܘܢ.
ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘ؛ ܢܟ̈ܬܬܐ ܡܪܝܪ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܚܘܝܐ ܒܚܘܗܝ ܡܦܩܕܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܡܪܬܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ.
ܡܢ ܕܢܟܬ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܚܝܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܚܝܐ:
ܚܪ ܒܗ ܒܡܚܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܕܬ ܡܪܬܗ ܡܢ ܗܕܡܘ̈ܗܝ،
ܡܢ ܕܐܬܡܪܡܪܘ ܚ̈ܝܝܢܐ ܚܝܝܢܐܝܬ:
ܫܠܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܚܬܐ ܫܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܬܐ.
ܠܐܝܟ ܘܐܬܦܫܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܠܡܐܫ ܡܪܬܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ:
ܕܒ ܡܪܝܪܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܝܕܥܬ ܡܪܝܪܘܬܗ.
ܒܡܟܐ ܕܡܫܠܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܡܬܒܠܛܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܪܝܪܐܝܬ:
ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܡܪܬܐ ܡܬܕܡܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܬ ܠܒܫ ܦܓܪܐ.
ܒܡܟܐ ܕܒܡܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܢܕܐ ܗܘܬ ܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ:
ܡܪܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܐܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܬܪܝܐ ܗܘܬ.
ܒܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܝܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܚܝܐ ܒܚܝܘܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܫܒܩܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܡܬܟܡܘ ܒܫܡܝܬܘܗ.
ܐܘ ܫܡܝܐ ܕܐܬܗܪ ܫܡܘܗ ܠܟܠܠܘܬܐ:

---

124. ܗܘ،] ܐܠܦ EG | ܐܝܟ] in marg. — 127. ܒܕ] read ܒܬ as EFG — 130. ܡܪܬ ܚܫܟܐ] ܠܡܪܬ ܚܫܟܐ EFG — 133. ܕܐܘܠܝ ܢܬܗܘܢ] ܕܐܘܠܝ ܬܗܘܢ EFG — 134. ܒܡܟܐܪ̈ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܗܢܬܗܘܢ] ܒܡܟܪ̈ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܒܗܢܬܗܘܢ EFG — 136. ܕܒܗܘܢ] ܕܒܗܘܢ D — 138. ܚܪ] add. in. ܘ I | ܒܗ] ܠܗ EFG | ܘܡܦܩܕܬ ܡܪܬܗ] ܘܡܦܩܕܬ ܡܪܬܐ EFG — 139. ܕܐܬܡܪܡܪܘ] del. and add. again in marg. in 2nd hand — 140. ܫܠܝܬ] ܫܠܡܬ EFG | ܕܠܐ] ܕ add. in 2nd hand — 142. ܕܒ ܡܪܝܪܐ ܗܘ،] ܘܒܪ ܡܪܝܪܐ EFG — 148. ܒܫܡܝܬܘܗ] ܒܫܡܝܬܘܗ E

ܘܥܒܕܗ̇ ܠܚܘܪܗ̇ ܒܬܪ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܟܣܐ ܒܓܘܗ̇.
ܐܘ ܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܕܓܒܝܠ ܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܚܘܝܬܐ:
ܕܐܚܝ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܬ ܚ̈ܘܝܐ.
ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܪ̈ܓܫܐ ܡܡܠܠ ܡܠܐ:
ܕܓܒܐ ܒܣܝ̈ܥܐ ܘܥܠܝ ܐܘܦ ܢ ܡܢ ܬܡܗܘܬܐ.
ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܠܕܣܡ ܠܗ ܕܠܟܢ ܕܡܢ:
ܕܗܘܐ ܚܬܝܐ ܕܪܕܦܐ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܟܐ̈ܒܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܐ.
ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܦܓܥ ܚܝܠ ܪܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠ ܒܗ:
ܕܬܟܣ ܡܪܬܐ ܕܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܦܘ̈ܫܐ.
ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
ܕܐܘܕܥ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܠܡܬܐܣܝܘ ܒܚܝܠ ܒܪܘܝܐ.
ܐܘܦ ܠܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܘ ܠܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܬ:
ܕܗܦܟܬ ܕܗܘܬܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܕܚܐܪ ܒܗ̇.
* f. 201v
ܐܪܐ ܚܙܬܟ ܡܦܣܩܐ * ܗܘܬ ܠܗ̇ ܠܡܚܬ ܚ̈ܘܝܐ:
ܐܘ ܕܠܡܐ ܒܗ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܐܪܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܚܝܢܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܡܚܝܢ ܪܙܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܚܝܐ ܠܥܡܐ:
ܐܘ ܕܠܡܐ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܪܝܗ، ܠܥܡܐ ܘܠܟܠ.
ܐܪܐ ܒܟܠܕܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܣܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܡܚܝܢ:
ܐܘ ܕܠܡܐ ܒܗ ܐܙܪܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܒܝܢ ܕܐܣܝܐ ܕܡܘܫܬܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܡܢܟܐ ܗ، ܕܒܕ ܫܬܩܘ ܐܝܬ ܡܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܐܝܬ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܚܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܒܬܐ ܡܠܝܐ ܒܥܬ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܐ ܪܓܫܐ:
ܘܚܝܠܐ ܪܒܐ ܒܥܡܐ ܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܕܪܙܐ ܡܚܝܢ.
ܒܬܐ ܕܟܠܝܢ ܡܬܬܝ ܕܐܥܡܐ ܒܬܐ ܕܟܠܝܢ:
ܗܘ، ܣܦܠܬܝ ܕܐܪܙܐ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܥܒܠ ܥܪܒܢ.
ܥܪܩܝܢ ܥܣܩܘ ܠܡܬܐ ܥܪܩܝܢ ܘܕܡ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ:
ܘܗܐ ܡܣܡܝܢ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܓܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܟܣܐ ܒܬܡܢ.
ܬܘ ܥܡ̈ܡܐ ܒܗ ܒܗܝ ܟܠܬܐ ܕܒܡܫܚ ܕܐܕܡ:
ܕܡܥܐ ܕܡܒܟܝܢ ܢܕܒ ܥܦܪܐ ܠܡܒܟܝܐ ܕܥܡ̈ܡܐ.
ܢܟܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܦܘܡ ܗܘܐ ܬܘܡܣܐ ܕܚܘܝܐ ܢܟܝܠܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܕܐܬܬܡ ܐܝܡܢ ܘܒܟܢ ܗܦܟ ܗ، ܕܗܦܟ.

---

152. ܚ̈ܘܝܐ] ܚ̈ܝܐ EFG — 156. ܕܗܘܐ] foll. by ܚܘܝܗ EFG | ܕܐ̈ܢܫܐ] om. EFG — 157. ܕܡܬܡܠܠ] ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ BCD — 160. ܕܐܘܕܥ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܐ] ܘܐܘܕܥ ܐ̈ܢܫܐ EFG — 161. ܐܘܦ] ܐܘ BCDEFG — 162. ܕܗܦܟܬ] ܘܗܦܟܬ E — 167. ܕܗܘܬ] ܕܪܙܬ EFG — 169. ܫܬܩܘ ܐܝܬ] ܫܬܩܐ ܐܝܬ EFG — 176. ܒܬܡܢ] in 2nd hand G — 178. ܕܡܒܟܝܢ] ܕܢܒܟܝܢ EFG, ܕܢܒܟܝܢ I

ܒܐܝܢܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܙܟܐ ܒܚܙܬܗ ܠܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܘܥܡܣܗ ܠܚܘܪܐ ܕܡܚܬ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܕܡܥܒܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
ܐܝܟ ܗܦܟܬ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܝܬܐ:
ܠܡܪܕܦ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܡܢ ܗܕ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚܒܠ̈ܢܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܒܗ ܬܘܒ ܒܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܪ̈ܓܫܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܛܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܒܕܘܝܗ.
ܠܟܢ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܡܬܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܚܝܢ:
ܘܠܘ ܗܘ ܒܥܡܩܗ ܡܬܡܪܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܘܬ ܥܡ̈ܡܬܐ.
ܐܢ ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܠܚܘܝܬܐ:
ܠܟܢ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܕܘܗ̇، ܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܚܒܠ̈ܢܐ.
ܐܢ ܠܐ ܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܠܡܬܠ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܐ:
ܠܟܢ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܝܬܐ.
ܡܢ ܢܟܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܪܓܫܐ ܠܡܬܪ ܓܒܝܐ:
ܘܡܢ ܡܚܘܬ ܗܘܐ ܢܟܝܐ ܥܠܝܐ ܠܡܬܢܝ ܡܠܬܐ.
ܐܢ ܡܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܒܝܢ ܥܬܝܩ̈ܐ ܗܕܐ ܠܡܥܒܪ:
ܠܟܢ ܠܐ ܡܒܪܘܗ̇ ܡܟܐܢ ܘܕܥܐ ܕܒܥܬ ܘܕܥܐ.
ܦܐܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܦܣ̈ܩܐ ܘܡܟܣܝܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܦ ܡܚܘܬܐ:
ܘܡܬܠܠ ܡܢܟܐ ܠܗ ܒܚܝܘܬܗ ܢ ܗ̣ܘܐ ܚܘܠܡܢܐ.
ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܬܬܝܡ ܡܠܐ ܗܘܦܟܝܗ̇ ܕܚܘܝܐ ܢܟܝܠܐ:
ܕܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܗܘ ܐܘ ܐܪܙ ܡܕܡ ܒܟܣܐ ܒܚܝܬܗ.
ܟܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܠܟܠܬܗ ܘܠܚܘܠܡܢܗ:
ܘܕܡܝܐ ܕܐܪܙܐ ܗ، ܡܢ ܟܠ ܟ̈ܠܠ ܕܒܡܟܣܐ.
ܠܐ ܗܘܘ ܡܦܣ̈ܩܐ ܠܡܥܒܪ ܗܕܐ ܕܗܦܟ ܚܘܝܗ:
ܘܐܦܠܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܟܠܬܐ ܘܕܡܝܐ ܕܒܟ̈ܠܐ.
ܫܡܥܬ ܗܘܦܟܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܐܝܕܗ ܕܠܐ ܪܓܫܐ:
ܘܪܡ ܘܡܬܠܠ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܡܟܒܫܐ ܕܪܟܒ ܒܟܒܗ.
ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܪܒ ܡܚܢܗ ܕܡܟܒܫܐ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܗܦܪܗ:
ܕܗܦܪ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܗܦܪ ܡܟܒܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܟܒܫܗ.
ܒܡܟܒܫܐ ܘܗܦܪܗ ܡܬܟܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܚܒܠ̈ܢܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܬܟܒܪܘ ܡܢ ܢܟܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ.
ܕܚܝܠ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܝܗ ܕܡܟܒܫܐ ܙܟܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ:

---

183. ܡܚܝܬܐ] add. in. ܕ BCD, ܡܚܝܬܬܐ EFG — 186. ܡܛܪܝܢ] ܢܛܪܝܢ EFG — 188. ܘܠܘ] ܘܠܐ EFG — 189. ܗܘ] ܗܘܐ EFG — 191. ܐܢ] add. in. ܘ EFG — 192. ܟܠ] repeated before corr. (dit.) — 193. ܡܢ] add. in. ܠ EFG | ܠܡܬܪ ܓܒܝܐ] ܠܐ ܓܡܥܬܢܐ EFG — 195. ܐܢ] add. in. ܘ EFG | ܗܕܐ ܠܡܥܒܪ] inv. EFG — 198. ܠܗ] ܠܐ EFG — 205. ܫܡܥܬ] ܫܕܥܬ EFG — 206. ܘܪܡ] ܕܪܡ BCD — 207. ܡܚܢܗ ܕܡܟܒܫܐ] ܐܦ ܡܢ ܡܟܒܫܐ EFG

ܘܠܚܘ̈ܫܬܐ ܥܫܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܘܒܝܫܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ.
ܟܠܗ ܡܒܝܫܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܟܠ ܢܟ̈ܬܬܐ:
ܠܐ ܡܒܐܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܚܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ.
* f. 202r ܚܙܬܐ ܕܢܚܫܐ ܡܫܝܪܐ * ܗܘܬ ܠܟܠ ܢܟ̈ܝܬܐ:
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܒܝܫܐ ܘܡܢ ܢܚܘܫܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ.
ܥܩܪ ܡܕܝܢ ܠܡܒܒܒܐ ܟܠܬܗ ܕܡܒܝܐ ܗ̱ܘ، ܘܟܠ ܐܢܫ:
ܘܡܛܠ ܕܡܒܝܐ ܒܝܕ ܘܐܬܚܫܒ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܡܒܝܫܐ.
ܟܬܒܘܬ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܬܘܪܬ ܡܫܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܬܗܪ ܐܝܟܐ:
ܕܐܡܪ ܦܠܝܓ ܚܘܠܡܢ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܡܟܣܬܐ ܗܘ.
ܗ̱ܘ، ܡܟܣܬܗ ܚܢ ܬܢܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܚܠܘܗܝ:
ܗܘܐ ܦܩܕ ܐܢܐ ܐܢܫ ܠܕܬܐ ܒܚܠܬ ܥܪܒܗ.
ܒܕܡܘܬ ܚܘܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܐ ܥܪܒܗ ܠܡܪܟܒ ܪܟܒܢ:
ܕܢܦܘܩ ܢܟܪ ܚܝܠ ܒܗܕܡܐ ܕܒܫܐ ܒܟܠܗ.
ܒܗܕܡ ܚܝܠܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܡܬܥܒܕ ܒܗ:
ܕܒܬܪ ܕܢܟܦܪ ܚܕܬܐ ܒܐܪܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܟܬܒ ܒܗ.
ܐܘܪܚܐ ܙܪܥ ܒܗ ܐܪܙܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܫܒܚܐ:
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܦܥܘܡܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܠܡܕܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ.
ܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܟܦܢ ܒܚܝܠܗ ܘܒܫܘܠܛܢܗ:
ܘܕܘܡܝܐ ܕܐܟܝܕܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܕܒܫܐ ܒܬܕܝܢ ܠܡܕܝܢ.
ܙܘܥܝܬ ܙܕܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܗ:
ܘܛܠܢ ܡܕܝܢܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܝܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܟܐܢܫܐ ܒܬܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܠܗ ܒܠܐ ܕܢܫܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܦܩܕ ܡܪܢ ܒܟܠܬ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ.
ܐܙܠ ܗ̱ܘ ܕܐܬ̈ܐ ܚܙ ܒܚܙܬܐ ܕܒܥܬܝܩܬܐ:
ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܕܐܬ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܬܬܒܪ ܚܙܬܗ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ.
ܒܬܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܟܢܪ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܠܡܬܩܢ ܒܚܕܬܘܬ ܚܝܠܗ:
ܘܚܝܠܗ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܠܓܢ ܟܠ ܗ̱ܘ ܕܐܬ̈ܐ.
ܒܚܝܘܗ ܟܠܚܘܕ ܢܗܒ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܠܡܚܝ̈ܢܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܬܒܒ ܒܗܡܝܢܘܬܐ ܚܙܬܐ ܕܦܘܪܩܢܐ.
ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܐܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܦ ܒܒ̈ܢܝܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܫܡܝܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܘܡܬܠܒܒܢܐ.

---

221. ܕܐܡܪ] ܕܐܟܘܠ EFG — 222. ܒܚܠܬ] ܒܚܕ ܢ EFG — 227. ܙܪܥ] ܙܪܥܢ EFG -- 230. ܘܕܘܡܝܐ] read ܘܕܘܡܝܐ as EFG | ܕܡܕܡ] ܠܡܕܡ D | ܕܒܫܐ] ܕܒܫܐ EFG

ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܒܬܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܙܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܣܡ ܬܘܟܠܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ.
ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܫܡܥܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܙܐ ܠܡܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܠܦ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܡܫܐܠ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܡܢ ܡܚܬ ܟܠܗ.
ܒܪܫ ܢ̈ܟܠܬܐ ܒܬܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܬܠܘܗܝ، ܟܠ ܪܫ ܡܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܠܦܗ ܠܡܟܝܐ ܕܢܬܠܘܗܝ، ܠܐܪܙܗ ܒܚܝܢ ܒܬ ܒܒܐ.
ܒܟܝܐ ܕܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܚܘܠܐ ܕܒܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܡܚܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ:
ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܠܕܡܘܬܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܚܘܠܐ.
ܡܛܠ ܚܘܠܐ ܗܒܘ ܚܘܝܐ ܟܠ ܒܒ̈ܢܝܐ:
ܘܠܐܢܫ؛ ܚܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܗܘܒܠ ܚ̈ܝܐ.
ܟܠܐ ܫܘܒܩܢܐ ܙܢܐ ܫܘܒܩ̈ܢܐ ܡܢ ܚܛ̈ܗܝܗܘܢ:
ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܕܦܩܘܡ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܒܩܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܒܕܘܠ.
ܒܡܫܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܢܐ ܥܡ ܚܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܡܒܐ:
ܕܡܒܐ ܕܡܚܝܢ ܠܡܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܒܡܫܬܐ ܠܐ ܢܕܘܢ ܕܐܡܪ.
ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܕܐ̈ܢ ܦܩܕ ܐܝܟ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܫܒܪ:
ܕܐܢܫܘ ܕܕܐ̈ܢ ܢܕܘܢ ܗ̇، ܕܗܘܬ ܘܐܡܪ ܗܕܐ.
ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܦܠܝܓ ܦܩܕ ܦܘܫ، ܒܚܘܠܡܢ ܚܘܝܐ:
ܕܐܢ ܥܬܝܩܐ ܝܗܒ ܫܘܠܡܢܐ ܒܒܝܐ ܡܠܠܐ.
ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܚܝܘܗܝ ܓܒܐ ܒܚܙܬܐ ܕܕܪܦܬ ܒܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܕܐܢ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܗܕܐ ܠܒܫܬ ܒܒܝܐ ܒܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܦܝ ܡܬܕܡܪ ܐܢܬ ܒܦܘܪܩ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܕܗܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܕܕܡܝܐ ܠܗܕܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܟܝ ܠܐ ܥܠܡ ܐܢܬ ܠܡܒܕܡ ܐܙܠܝܢ:
ܕܗܐ ܒܝܢ ܝܪܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܒܡܒܥ̈ܐ ܒܪܠܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܥܪܝܪܐ ܠܟܝ ܕܐܚܙܝܢ ܡܟܠܝ:
ܘܐܡܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܢܫܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܠܐ ܡܦܪܠ ܐܢܬ.
* f. 202v ܐܪܐ ܚܙܬܐ ܕܢܚܫܐ ܦܪܩܬܟ ܡܢ * ܦܘܡ ܚܘ̈ܝܐ:
ܘܒܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܒܡܠܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܒܕܪܐ ܐܢܬ.
ܐܪܐ ܘܐܢ ܠܐ ܟܠܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܒܠܬܗ ܕܚܘܝܐ:
ܕܡܒܝܐ ܗ̱ܘ، ܘܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܘܡܛܠ ܡܒܝܐ ܒܗ ܐܬܚܫܒܬ.
ܐܢ ܥܪܝܪ ܠܟܝ ܕܐܢܫ ܒܐܒ̈ܢܝܟܝ ܐܝܟ ܡܒܐ ܕܐܢܫ:

---

245. ܠܡܘܬܐ] om. ܠ EFG — 248. ܕܢܬܠܘܗܝ، ܠܐܪܙܗ] ܕܢܬܠܐ ܐܪܙܗ EFG -- 252. ܘܠܐܢܫ؛] ܘܠܢܫ، CEFG, ܘܠܐ ܢܫ؛ I -- 255. ܡܢܐ] corr. in marg. from ܡܠܐ | ܠܡܒܐ] ܠܡܠܒܐ I — 259. ܠܐܢܫܐ] ܢܫܐ above line F — 269. ܕܢܚܫܐ ܦܪܩܬܟ] corr. from inv. F — 271. ܘܐܢ ܠܐ] ܘܐܠܐ EFG

ܠܡܢ ܡܬܬܦܠܓ ܐܢܬ ܟܠ ܐܣܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ.
ܪܒ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܗ̣ܘܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܛܒ ܡܢ ܚܘܝܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܪܒܐ ܪܒܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܕܚܫ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܫܬܘܩ ܠܟ ܡܕܝܢ ܡܫܪܝܢܐ ܚܘܪ ܒܣܡܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̇ ܓܠܝܘܗ̇ܝ، ܠܡܘܫܬܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܟܕ ܓܠܝܬܟ.
ܥܠܝܟ ܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܗܪܛܠܘܩܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ:
ܠܐ ܬܪܘܕܝܗ̇ ܠܡܪ̈ܕܝܬ ܡܠܬܢ ܟܪܝܣܘܬܟ.
ܥܘܐ ܠܝ ܟܡܕܪ̈ܐ ܕܪܚܡܬܘܬܟ ܡܢ ܕܡܘܕܝܢܐ:
ܟܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܫܠܝܛ ܥܡ ܒܥܘܬܟ ܡܢ ܕܐܒܘܬܟ.
ܚܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܟ ܘܕܡܘܕܝܢܐ:
ܕܛܠܠܬ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܦܓܪܢܘܬܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
ܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܗܡܠ ܦܘܪܩ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܗ̣ܘܐ ܒܐܢܫ̈ܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܒܕܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܐܬܝܐ ܒܐܢܫܐ ܦܘܪ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ.
ܒܐܢܫܐ ܦܪܝܩܐ ܐܢܫܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܘ ܚܪ̈ܝܢܐ:
ܘܡܫܪ̇ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܚܘܝܐ ܒܐܪܙ ܦܘܪܩܢܟ.
ܐܡܒܝܐ ܠܡ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܒܡܕܒܪܐ:
ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒ̣ ܐܦ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ ܠܡܬܬܪܡܘ.
ܗ̇ܘ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܒܚܕܐ:
ܗܘ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܣܝ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܒܝܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ.
ܗ̇ܘ ܡܢ ܒܝܢܐ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܚܘܝܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ:
ܗܘ ܬܘܒ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܚܠܠܐ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܟܠܐ.
ܒܐܪܙ ܪܘܡܪܡܐ ܕܒܡܠܠܐ ܒܝܬ ܥܬܝܩܐ:
ܘܒܫܘܠܛܢܗ ܡܢܐ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܠܚܪܕܦ ܒܐ̈ܦܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ، ܐܦ ܬܘܩܦܗ ܐܦ ܪܘܡܪܡܗ:
ܕܢܕܪܘܫ ܐܪܘܢܐ ܠܪܘܡܪܡ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܟܒܝܫܐ.
ܠܐܢܫܐ ܪܘܡܪܡ ܚܝܠ ܒܘܪܟܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܘܐܢܫܐ:
ܘܠܒܪܗܘܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܘܡܚܠܠܐ.
ܒܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܒܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܟܠܢ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܕ̈ܐ:
ܘܒܪܢܫܐ ܠܒܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܟܠܢ̈ܐ ܘܚܙ̈ܘܐ ܒܫܢ̈ܐ.
ܒܚܘܪܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܡܬܬܦܠܓ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܠܡܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ:
ܘܦܘܪܩ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ.

---

274. ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ] inv. I — 275. ܚܘܝܐ] add. in. ܕ BCD — 276. ܕܚܫ̈ܘܬܐ] om. ܕ EFG — 277. ܡܫܪܝܢܐ] ܐܡܫܪܝܢܐ EFG — 278. ܘܠܐ] before corr. foll. by ܕܡܢ B, om. ܘ EFG | ܬܪ̇ ܓܠܝܘܗ̇ܝ] ܬܪ̇ ܓܠܝܘܗ̇ܝ، DEFG — 280. ܠܐ] before corr. foll. by ܕܡܢ B, foll. by ܕܡܢ D | ܬܪܘܕܝܗ̇] corr. from ܬܪܘܕܝ — 281. ܕܡܘܕܝܢܐ] om. in. ܕ EG — 287. ܦܪܝܩܐ] ܦܪ̈ܝܩܐ BCD | ܚܪ̈ܝܢܐ] om. sey. BCDEFG — 288. ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܚܘܝܐ] ܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܪܝܡ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ EFG | ܦܘܪܩܢܟ] ܦܘܪܩܢܗ EFG — 290. ܒܪܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ] corr. in marg. from ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ A, ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ EFG — 297. ܐܦ ܬܘܩܦܗ] ܗܘܐ ܬܘܩܦܗ EFG — 301. ܒܐܪ̈ܙܐ] add. in. ܠ EFG — 303. ܚܝ̈ܐ] ܚܘܝܐ EFG

ܡܢ ܪ ܗܘܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܒܫܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܠܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܓܠܝܐ ܚ̈ܘܝܐ ܐܦ ܒܡܬܬܐ.
ܡܘܬܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܡܢ ܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܡܬܒܥܘ:
ܘܚܘܒܬ ܚ̈ܘܝܐ ܒܣܡܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܠܡܚܒܫܘ.
ܠܦܠܓܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܪ ܓܘܢܐ:
ܕܠܐ ܕܠܗ ܗܘܬ ܕܢܓܕܘܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܐܢܫܐ ܗܘ.
ܐܢܫܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܓܕܘܪ ܐܢܫ̈ܐ ܒܚܝܠ ܒܪܘܝܐ:
ܘܦܩܕ ܕܢܥܗ̇ ܠܚܒܝܪܘܬܗ ܒܕܡܢ ܪ ܚܝܘ.
ܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܓܫܪ ܚܘܝܐ ܦܩܕ ܡܐܬܬܗ:
ܕܒܡܒܢܝܢܐ ܢܐܫܐ ܒܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܡܬܢܟܝ̈ܢܐ.
ܠܗܬܬ ܥܟܪ̈ܐ ܫܒܪܗ̇ ܠܗܕܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܘܐܢܫܐ:
ܕܒܗ̇ܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܟܚܕ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܚܝܐ ܠܐܢܫܐ.
ܒܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܠܘ ܪܫ ܫܝ̈ܡܗܘܢ ܠܢܫ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ:
ܘܒܝܕ ܚܘܝܐ ܐܣܝ ܒܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܕܚܘ̈ܬܐ.
ܠܗܘܢ ܪܕܦ ܗܘܐ ܒܐܪܙ ܚܘܠܡܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ:
ܕܢܘܕܥ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܢܦܩ ܩܠܐ ܕܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ ܒܗ.
ܘܡܒܪ ܐܟܪܢܘ ܟܕ ܪܕܦ ܗܘܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܐܬܠܠܘ ܟܕ ܪܕܦ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܠܓܝܘܢ.
ܘܡܒܪ ܦܓܪܗ ܟܕ ܚܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܚܘܠܡܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ:
* f. 203r
ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܙܒܢܐ * ܕܡܬܚܠܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗܘܒܠ ܥܡܐ.
ܟܒܪ ܗܪ ܓܒܝ ܗܘܘ ܒܗܪ ܓܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܢܚܣܘܢ:
ܕܐܪܐ ܡܒܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܚܕܬܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܒܝܬ ܡܟܠ̈ܬܐ.
ܐܝܟ ܓܒܫܬ ܕܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܟܠ ܡܫܬܐ ܒܐܝܕܗ:
ܗܦܟ ܡܚܝܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܡܬܬܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܦܩ̈ܗܝ.
ܐܬܠܐ ܠܒܥܘ ܗܘܘ ܠܗܘܒܠ ܚܘܝܐ ܘܠܗܘܒܠ ܡܢ:
ܕܐܡܢ ܡܐܣܝܢ ܒܐܬ̈ܐ ܘܚܙ̈ܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܫܒܝ̈ܩܢܐ.
ܠܗܘܒܠ ܡܢ ܐܒܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܬܬܐܪܬ:
ܕܦܓܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܡܬܐܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܡܠܬ ܦܘܡܗ.
ܒܗ ܘܒܚܘܝܐ ܬܗܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܡܬܬܡܗܝܢ ܗܘܘ:
ܕܒܡܠܬ ܕܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܐܙܠܐ ܠܦܫܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܦܘܪ̈ܢܘܗܝ.
ܘܐܚܝܘܗ ܕܟ̈ܐܕܐ ܬܡܗܘ ܘܐܬܕܟܪܘ ܒܡܫܬܐ ܘܐܪܙܐ:

---

306. ܐܦ] ܐܝܟ EFG — 308. ܠܡܚܒܫܘ] ܠܡܚܒܪܘ EFG — 312. ܠܚܒܝܪܘܬܗ] corr. from ܠܚܒܝ ܪܘܬܗ — 316. ܕܐܟܚܕ ܠܐܢܫܐ] ܕܐܟܚܕ ܐܢܫܐ EFG — 321. ܘܡܒܪ] ܘܡܒܪܘ B — 327. ܕܐܟܠ] ܕܐܟܠܢ EFG — 333. ܘܡܬܬܡܗܝܢ] ܘܬܡܗܝܢ EFG — 334. ܒܝܕ] ܒܚܝܠ EFG — 335. ܒܡܫܬܐ ܘܐܪܙܐ] ܒܡܫܬܐ ܘܐܪܙܗ EFG, ܒܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܘܒܡܫܬܐ I

ܢܦܩ ܝܗܘܕܝܐ ܘܦܪܘܫܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܬܪܥܐ.
ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܡܫܟܢܘܬܐ ܢܦܩܘܢ ܛ̈ܠܠܐ:
ܒܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܡܥܠ ܥܡܗ ܠܬܘܕܝܬ ܘܡܫܬܐ.
ܐܪܙܐ ܘܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܢܚܣܘܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܟܘܡܪܘܬܐ:
ܘܐܚܕ ܬܪܥܐ ܕܫܪܝܪܘܬܗ ܩܕܡ ܐܦ̈ܝܗܘܢ.
ܚܘܝܐ ܒܫܬܘܩܗ ܢܛܪ ܕܚܝܐ ܥܡ ܡܠ̈ܟܘܗܝ:
ܕܠܐ ܡܚܙܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܕܪܕܝܢ ܠܡܬܪܥܡܘ.
ܐܪܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܬܐ ܒܪܐ ܘܐܬܚܙܝ:
ܘܠܐܕܡ ܕܬܐܡ ܦ̈ܠܓܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܚܝܐ ܕܚܝܠܘܗܝ، ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ:
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܚܝܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܠܗܝ ܠܐ ܡܐܟܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܗܒ ܠܗ ܚܝܠ ܒܕܘܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܚܝܫܐ:
ܘܥܒܘܗܝ ܩܝܡ ܒܪ ܠܐ ܕܚܝܠܘܗܝ، ܥܡ ܐܬܚܬܝܬܐ.
ܒܗ ܗܘ ܕܪ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܚܝܐ:
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܕܒܪ ܠܢܒܝܘܬ ܕܪ ܠܗ ܒܟܦܐ ܫܘܢܩܗ.
ܒܥܠܬ ܕܪ ܠܗ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܚܠܝܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܫܥܝܐ:
ܘܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܐܬܚܘܝ، ܚܫܝܒ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ.
ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܐܦܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ ܡܬܗܢܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܒܕ ܡܕܡ.
ܡܕܡ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܡܚܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܪܝܪ ܥܠ ܟܠ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܚܫܝܒ ܒܠܒܕ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ.
[ܠܘ ܡܕܡ ܚܘܝܐ ܚܪܫܐ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ:]
ܘܗܟܢ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܕܠܚܘܫܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܚܫܒܗ.
ܢܒܘܥܐ ܠܡ ܠܚܘܫܬܐ ܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܠܫܢܗ:
ܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܪܪܐ ܕܒܫܘܒ̈ܚܐ ܠܡܫܒܚܢܐ.
ܠܡܫܒܚܢܐ ܡܚܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܪܪ ܘܠܒܪ ܒܦܓܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ:
ܘܦܠܚܘܬܗ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܫܒܩ ܐܪܪ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ.
ܐܪܪ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܫܒܩ ܚܪܫܐ ܒܝܬ ܒܪ̈ܢܫܐ:
ܘܐܝܟ ܒܪܘܪܐ ܡܚܬ ܫܘܠܛܢܗ ܥܠ ܡܬܐܬܘܬܗ. [...]
ܘܠܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܚܠܠܐ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܗ:
ܕܠܐ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܥܡ ܫܘܒ̈ܚܘܗܝ.

---

339. ܘܬܫܡܫܬܐ] ܕܬܫܡܫܬܐ EFG — 341. ܡܠ̈ܟܘܗܝ] ܢܠ̈ܟܘܗܝ EFG — 347. ܒܕܘܝܢܐ] ܚܘܠܒܢܐ EFG — 349. ܪ ܒ] ܪ ܡ EFG | ܫܡܝܐ] add. sey. EFG — 350. ܠܢܒܝܘܬ] ܠܢܒܝܬ EFG — 353. ܡܕܡ ܗܘܐ] ܗܘ ܡܕܡ EFG — 355. ܥܠ] ܡܢ EFG — 357. ܠܘ ܡܕܡ ܚܘܝܐ ܚܪܫܐ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ] om. ABCDI, read as EFG — 364. om. stich AI, ܐܪܪ ܚܡܝܣܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܗ ܫܘܠܛܢܗ B(in marg.) CD, ܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܐܪܝܬܐ ܡܐܬܘܬܗ EFG — 366. ܫܘܒ̈ܚܘܗܝ] corr. from ܫܘܒܚܗ B

ܘܫܠܡ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܒܥ̈ܝܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܬܗ̇ ܠܒܪܘܪܘܬܗ.
ܐܘ ܒܪܘܪܐ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܚܠܠܐ:
ܕܐܫܬܒܚ ܒܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ ܛܠܠܐ ܚܙܬܐ ܕܚܘܝܬ ܐܝܢܐ.
ܐܘ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܪܐ ܚܠܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܘܡܢ ܗܠܟ̈ܬܐ:
ܕܒܟܪ ܐܝܟ ܠܡܥܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܡܠܝܠܘܬܗ.
ܐܘ ܕܠܒܪ ܒܗ ܚܝܠ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܒܕܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܒܗ:
ܘܡܢ ܬܗܘܢ، ܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܕ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܐ ܫܡܫ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܗ.
ܐܘ ܒܡܠܐ ܫܦܝܪ ܫܪܝܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܠܐ ܫܦܝܪܐ:
ܘܒܕ ܐܝܬ ܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܫܦܝܪܘ ܒܗܝܢ ܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܡܢ ܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ.
ܐܘ ܠܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܠܐܢܫܐ ܡܢ ܫܦܝܪܐ:
ܕܗܦܟܢ ܐܫܦܝܪ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܒܐܬܪܐ ܕܒܗ.
* ܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܚܘܝܐ ܘܡܬܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܕܚܫܝܐ: * f. 203v
ܘܫܒܚܬܐ ܕܒܚܝܢ ܠܗ ܕܠܝܢ ܗ، ܐܠܐ ܕܫܒܚܐ.
ܫܒܚܐ ܒܫܘܒܚܗ ܒܒܝܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܕܫܦܝܪܬܐ:
ܕܒܟܐܪ ܒܝܢ ܠܚܘܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܐ ܟܐܕ̈ܝܢ.
ܡܕܝܢ ܠܘ ܠܢ ܡܠܘܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܡܠܘ ܠܢ:
ܐܠܐ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܡܚܝܠܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܚܝܠܗ.
ܚܝܠ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܒܐ ܒܐܪܙܐ ܚܝܫܐ:
ܘܗܘ ܬܘܒ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܒܐ ܡܚܘܬܐ ܒܫܘܫܬܐ ܚܝܐ.
ܒܫܘܫܬܐ ܢܚܫܐ ܕܚܝܠܗ ܡܚܘܐ ܠܗ، ܘܠܗܕܐ:
ܕܚܝܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܡܝܬܐ ܘܐܚܝܢܬܐ.
ܒܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠܗ ܦܪܫ ܠܗ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܠܡܠܟܘܬ ܪܘܡܐ:
ܘܒܗ ܦܪܩ ܡܢ ܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܕܚܒܠܐ ܘܡܘܬܐ.

---

373. ܫܡܫ] read ܫܡܫܘ as BCDEFG — 375. ܘܒܕ] ܕܒܕ EFG — 377. ܕܐܝܟ] ܕܐܝܟ EFG — 378. ܚܘܝܐ] ܚܘܝܢܐ EFG — 384. ܐܝܟ] ܚܝܠ EFG | ܠܒܒܐ] ܠܒܠܒܐ I — 387. ܕܚܝܠܗ] add. in. ܘ EFG — 388-389. ܫܘܠܛܢܗ: ܢܣܒܐ ܒܟܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܪܡܐ ܡܢ ܫܠܝ EFG

ܒܟܠ ܙܢ̈ܝܢ ܘܒܟܠ ܕܡ̈ܝܢ

The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy

An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai

Part 2. Translation

Preface

The Text of the Translation

The translation of the six homilies presented in the volume of the critical text edition is as literal as possible, sometimes to the detriment of the poet's fluid style. Parentheses have been placed around words necessary for the understanding of the text yet absent in the syriac. Square brackets indicate lacunae in the base manuscript which have not been supplemented by readings from other mss. The grouping of the stiches by two (or by four for Hom. II) follows the arrangement of the stiches in the critical edition with the addition of an indentation of the second stich (and the fourth in Hom. II) for clarity.

The Footnotes

The abbreviation corr. indicates that the text has been corrected on the basis of proposals found in the apparatus of the text edition. These proposals may or may not be derived from variant readings. Corr. is also used when lacunae have been filled in on the basis of other mss. However, where more than one alternative is available, these are presented in the footnotes. Variant readings from other mss. which are viable (both grammmatically and contextually) have also been provided in the footnotes.

The remaining footnotes pertain to the contents of the homilies. These include biblical references whereby no distinction has been made between literal citations and paraphrases. Allusions (but not direct quotes) to biblical verses which in their own context do not refer to the biblical passages treated in the homilies (e.g. Gen. 6–11, Ex. 25 and Nu. 21) are preceded by cf. References to parallel passages in greek works of the Antiochene School as well as in other works relevant to the Syrian (mainly East-Syrian) exegetical tradition have also been made.

For the abbreviations used in the notes, see the Bibliography in the volume of the Study.

Homily I

On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah

Homily I

On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah[1]

Sin and death fell upon Adam like marauders
and they stripped him, abandoning him without cover, naked.
Naked did the head of our race depart from Paradise
and in mourning did those kindred to his spirit sit on account of his departure.
In great mourning did the spiritual beings sit on account of man
for they had heard that death was going to undo the structure of his body.
The sentence for his offense were they contemplating
and they were grievous about how the image of the Creator was perishing.
"Image of the Creator" did the Creator call him when fashioning him[2]
and when they heard the news of his returning to his earth, they turned and lamented.[3]
His return to his land distressed the heavenly beings
and they gave up hope that he would ever come back to life.
Within the life force of his life were they bound[4] when he was fashioned
and they were greatly saddened by his separation from their side.
The corruption of his body saddened them inordinately
at how they were parting society with the rational image.
At his rationality had they been wondering, at how glorious it was
for the soul uttered, through the senses of the body, rational voices.
Pleasant was the sound of his tones to them prior to his offense
and once he had offended and sinned, they were astonished and amazed by his fall.
Sin overthrew the image kindred to the heavenly beings
and gave him as prey to voracious death and it lacerated his body.[5]
As at a dead man were they looking at him dead in iniquity
and they did not desist from sadness on account of his mortality.
A dead man did they reckon him from the time he ate the fruit

---

[1] AI: "Written by the Same (Author). Homily Fifty. On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah". BCDE: "Another Written by the Same (Author). On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah." C adds in the margin: "7". I adds in the margin: "Homily 50. On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah".

[2] Gen. 1,26–27.

[3] For the angels' mourning cf. Gignoux, IV, 274–283.

[4] For man as the bond of the universe in Narsai's homilies cf. McLeod, "Image of God", p. 458–467 and Gignoux, I, 149–156; III, 265–266. This idea frequently occurs in Theodore e.g. Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 71,26–44 and Sachau p. 7,5–24; p. 24,15–17.

[5] Cf. McLeod, IV, 41–62 where Satan's suit against man is presented to Christ.

and especially from (the time of) that voice (which said) "You will return to the earth".[6]
To the earth did that commandment return the earthly being
and he departed to reside outside of the domain of Paradise.
Outside of the place in which he had dwelled did the mortal one dwell
and all around He stationed a wall of fire[7] before him that he not enter it.[8]
The wall of fire were the spiritual beings considering
and they marvelled at what the desire for fruit had done.
The desire for fruit expelled Adam from Paradise
and glad were the demons and sad the gatherings of heavenly beings.
The entire creation sat in mourning on account of his departure
and plaintively bewailed the deadliness of his iniquity.
As a house of wailing was the world on account of man
and the sound of its lamentations was being spoken by all mouths.
Rational and dumb beings were bewailing his mortality
and they did not desist from (their) sighs on account of his corruption.
His guilt fenced before him a fence[9] of fire
and he longed but was not able to enter his place.
Into exile did the Divine Commandment cast him
and as a malevolent one did he live in the land of thorns.
Upon thorns and thistles did the king of earth feed[10]
and he was sighing doubly on account of his humiliation.
Laborious was his labor and vexed his course and penurious his food[11]
and turbulent was the change of seasons in his day.[12]
At the pains of his being were rational and dumb ones pained
and they were recounting the modes of his afflictions aloud and in silence.
Aloud and in silence were the modes of his afflictions being spoken
and generation to generation was transmitting the sadness of his life.

---

[6] A combination of Gen. 3,19, "until you return to the earth" and 3,23 "and the Lord God sent him forth ... to till the earth".

[7] Cf. Pesh. Zach. 2,9 *šurā d-nurā*. The notion of fire reflects LXX Gen. 3,24 φλογίνη ῥομφαία, a flaming, circulating sword as in Theodore (Tonneau, p. 56,6-11). For the notion of a wall cf. Alexandre, "L'épée de flamme", p. 416-418 and st. 41 below.

[8] Gen. 3,24.

[9] The use of "fence" (*syāgā*) is attested in Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 29,21-22; 46,29-30). For the relation to Eph. 2,14 cf. Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 62-66.

[10] Gen. 3,18.

[11] Gen. 3,18-19.

[12] The turbulence of seasons is not noted in Gen. 3 but is presumed by Narsai to be the cause of the lack of food on the basis of Gen. 8,21-22. There God promises that seed and fruits and change of season will always exist because He will no longer curse the earth. Narsai thus considers the curse of the earth at the time of the expulsion to be undone by Noah, see below Hom. II, st. 753-762 and III, st. 17-21 and the similar passage in Diyarb., p. 53,8-10 and Išo'dad, p. 110,3-8 and 122,22-26. This opinion is contrary to that of Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,11-18) who thinks that the disturbance of the seasons which ends in Gen. 8,21-22 lasted the one year of the flood.

Effectively he learned about mortality
and death began to corrupt his children mercilessly.
With the sons of Adam did death, which Adam had introduced, begin
and it swallowed Abel,[13] the beloved first born of righteousness.[14]
With the death of the just one, death came to rule over mortals[15]
and men became slaves of death and of the Calumniator.
In deed were the sentences against the guilty ones fulfilled
and vanquished[16] and given as a pledge was the nature of mortals to mortality.
As a pledge did sin take Adam's body
and gave it to death so that it feed upon it gluttonously.[17]
Gluttonously did the eater eat the food
and without mercy the ferocious one lacerated the captive.
Upon all men did the corruption of the corruptor pass
and no man remained upon whom the claw of death had not fastened.
On account of his corruption were heaven and earth mourning
and they sighed and travailed painfully.
The travails of death were striking at all of creation[18]
and it was waiting for the time when it would bear the hope of life.[19]
These pains did the Creator, by whom all things are seen, see
and He announced suddenly good hope to those without hope.
Good hope did the Creator sow in the ears of man
through one man who was not enslaved to the slavery of death.
One man did He preserve carefully without corruption
and He consoled the world in its sadness which was on account of man.
For the consolation of man did the lover of man translate[20] Enoch
and He preserved him alive[21] so that in him be preserved hope for mankind.
Hope did He proclaim through the translation of that pleasing one
and because he did greatly please, He made his pleasantness hope for mankind.
"The just one pleased" is written about the just one in Moses's book[22]

---

[13] Gen. 4,8

[14] Mt. 23,35; Heb. 11,4.

[15] Rom. 5,14.

[16] The verb *ḥāb* also has the meaning "to become guilty" or "indebted".

[17] Cf. Hab. 2,5.

[18] Rom. 8,22.

[19] Rom. 8,25.

[20] The verb *šanni* corresponds to μετέθηκεν of LXX Gen. 5,24 whereas Pesh. uses the verb *nsab* ("he wasn't there for God took him"). The verb *šanni* occurs in the Pesh. of Heb. 11,5 where the Greek has μετέθηκεν once again. In addition, it is used in Ephrem's paraphrase of Gen. 5,24 (Tonneau, p. 55,7).

[21] Heb. 11,5.

[22] Gen. 5,22.24.

and because he pleased He preserved his pleasantness in the treasury of life.
As in an image He depicted the image of his pleasing ways
and He annointed him with immortal life so that he not be corrupted.
85 Pains had effaced the seemly pleasantness of Adam's image
and He renewed through Enoch that fashioning which death had corrupted.
The corruption of death did the Creator undo through Enoch's life
and He consoled men so that they no more be saddened on account of corruption.
On account of their corruption were the children of Adam mourning
90 from Adam until (the time when) Enoch was pleasing to God.
With lashes of death were the sons of the mortal one being lashed
and there was no hope which proclaimed hope for man's mortality.
Six generations did the lashes of those lashed extend[23]
and in the seventh they heard the voice of the announcement of life.
95 In the seventh generation did mortals hear the tidings of life
and although they heard it, they did not suffice to comprehend it accurately.
They heard indeed that voice concerning Enoch's life
and they wondered why and for what reason He preserved him alive.
All of them heard the good news of the just one's translation
100 yet they were not able to aim at the mark of revival of the dead.
Not openly did they learn the cause of the abolition of death
but through a symbol the hearing of which was manifest but the meaning of which was hidden.
Symbolically did the spiritual beings hear it
and symbolically were they reflecting upon its explanation.
105 Through this symbol the lovers of man dispelled their sadness
and they began to rejoice at the good news of the renewal of man.
In great mourning had they been sitting on account of man
and when they all heard the news of his life they rejoiced and were consoled.
The life of Enoch consoled the heavenly beings
110 and incited them to proceed with the order of their activities.
The transgression of the commandment had weakened their love towards man
and they hadn't wished to fluctuate the movements of the air.

---

[23] Corr.

Vain labor did they consider labor on man's behalf[24]
and they were resisting proceding on the way of his activity.[25]
115 The hidden Hint[26] had subjugated them to labor greatly
and they accepted and fulfilled that commandment which had subjugated them.
The Hidden One's commandment did the spiritual beings, man's attendants, fulfill
and the more so from Enoch's translation onwards.
Enoch removed the sentence of mortality
120 and he pacified man and heavenly beings through the translation of his life.[27]
His life cut off the way of death symbolically
prior to that time when it would be cut off in deed.
As a deposit for peace did the Lord of the world take him[28] to His side
and He preserved him alive so that he proclaim life to those of his race.
125 Rebellion did the sons of the rebellious one raise against the Lord of the universe
and He subdued them with the harsh lashes of mortality.
With death did He lash that harshness - rebellion raiser -
and He pitied it in compassion by preserving the life of one man.
One man did He choose in one time–span of ten generations[29]
130 and He clasped him to His side as a pledge on behalf of the guilty ones.[30]
Guilty were all of the Adamite race
and they confessed yet did not recompense the debt of debts.
For this purpose did He take Enoch as a pledge

---

[24] Rom. 8,20.

[25] Cf. Gignoux, VI, 281–294. For the union of creation, including the angels, for man's service cf. Theodore (Sachau, p. 16,8f.; Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 71,24f.). For the hope procured by Enoch for the angels who thought their labor in vain cf. Cyrus, p. 153,14–27 and p. 154,3 and Cosmas, II, 84–89, 96 (Wolska, I, p. 403–409; 415) and V, 73 (Wolska, II, p. 111).

[26] The term *remzā* is used by Narsai alongside of *puqdānā* (Divine Commandment), *ḥaylā* (Force) and *ṣebyānā* (Will). Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 3, p. 329 translates "Signe" and says it means "nutus" or "sign of the head" in the sense of a Divine command. Jansma, "Barhebraeus", p. 109–110 distinguishes *remzā* as a movement which can be seen, from *puqdānā* which is a word which is heard. He submits that *remzā* as used by Narsai and Jacob of Sarug "means the nod or gesture by which God indicates His will". It is in this sense that "Hint" is to be understood in the translations of Hom. I–VI.

[27] Cf. Diyarb., p. 52,8–14.

[28] Pesh. Gen. 5,24.

[29] These are the ten generations from Adam to Noah.

[30] "Guilty ones" or "debtors". So too st. 131.

that they remember to recompense the debt to the Fashioner of the universe.[31]
The bill of debts[32] did they owe from the beginning
and not having recompensed it, they recompensed it through Enoch while unwilling.
As a guarantee was the pleasing one for those of his race
that they recompense the bill of debt of their deeds.
By various means He taught them to recompense love
and He repaid the love of His benignity to the righteous.
It was not the righteous who compelled Him so that He made peace with man,
for He knew before He made peace that He would make peace.
Seen by His love was the peace which He would make in Enoch's day
and his translation too was planned before He translated him.
He knew that which He would do at the beginning of time
and manifest to Him was that which was to be in the second age.
All these ages were seen eternally by the Fashioner of the ages
and ordered were their successions before they came into being.
He was aware of the erring of Adam and his sons before they erred
and He had planned to undo death and make error pass.
By various means did He reveal His will – He who wills our life –
and He gave us hope through the translation of a man from among us.
He translated Enoch and preserved him in immortal life
and through his translation He procured hope for ten generations.
Good hope did the earlier generations acquire through Enoch's life
and as a guide was his translation for those who came after.
Upon the way of life did his offspring go in the hope of life
and they began to recount the mystery of their lives from generation to generation.
Lamech openly declared this mystery
when recounting the modes of benefits towards man.[33]
Noah, like thunder, caused the voice of his blessings to be heard
and showed that the time of man's renewal was near.[34]
Through his blessings the righteous one revealed his Lord's will:
that He had planned to redeem man through a man.
In Abraham all hope-bearing words were fulfilled
for in the harbor of his love the hope of twenty generations came to rest.

---

[31] Cf. Theod. b. Koni, p. 90,17–19 and Diyarb., p. 52,16–18. Išo'dad, p. 109,9–11 similarly sees Enoch as an incitement for the practice of virtue but follows Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,6–11) when adding Adam to those who saw Enoch so that he not think the latter died like Abel.

[32] Col. 2,14.

[33] Gen. 5,29.

[34] Gen. 9,25–27. See below, Hom. III.

Twenty generations went forth from Adam to Abram
and their course came to rest in the peaceful harbor of one man.
One was Abram and one his love for his Lord
and because of his love He made him a harbor for his fellows.
A harbor of peace was Abraham for those of his race
and in him came to rest the ships of the spirit of divine revelations.
From Abraham onwards man began to love truth
and so too the Creator revealed His will towards men.
One was God's will towards man
and He disclosed it through the just ones through means of all sorts.
To Abraham He said that through his seed He would bless the peoples[35]
and to the son of Jesse, that from his posterity He would establish the kingdom.[36]
One by one they transmitted the promise of His words
and there was no period in which He did not show the modes of His will.
To the good ones He showed the great love of His benignity
so that they sow good hope in the ears of man.
At all times He sowed the seed of man's redemption
while[37] watering with various revelations instead of drops.
Through revelations He instructed man and heavenly beings
so that they know to go upon the way of the name of the Divine Essence.
A great way did He prepare in the prophets in order to go towards Him
and He showed it the more in the son of the settlers,[38] prophet and priest.
A prophet and priest did He choose at the time of the division of times
in order that He show the modes of His will to mankind.
The whole force of His activity did He deliver into his hands[39]
so that he go and win over his people through the reverence of truth.
A divine guardian did He make him on earth
so that he sustain the servants of his Lord from the house of his Lord.
With a just supply did the just one supply the servants of his Lord
and wisely did he give sustenance in famine and satiety.[40]
With the lash of famine did he chastise the rebellious against his Lord
and he taught them not to exalt themselves over the Creator.
A stiff neck did the rebellious sons of Abraham acquire
and as with a yoke the son of the settlers subded them.
A harsh yoke was the voice of that zealot

---

[35] Gen. 22,18.

[36] 2 Sam. 7,(11–)16.

[37] Corr.

[38] Pesh. 1 K. 17,1. According to Išo'dad (III, p. 117,4–7), Elijah, as a priest, was called a settler because priests didn't have proper cities but dwelled in the cities designated to them.

[39] 1 K. 18,46.

[40] 1 K. 17,7–16; 18, esp. 41–45.

and he subdued the wild ones while they were unwilling.
While unwilling they chose the lordship of (the name of) God[41]
and while not acquiescing they despised and rejected the service of demons.[42]
Necessitated by the name of the Creator they loved the Creator
and as for the abomination of idolatry, they hated occupation with it.
A source of lashes did the mouth of the son of the settlers become
and it was watering them with various violent blows.
Like a rod did he clasp the commandment of his Lord
and he was chastising with it the stubborn people, lovers of error.
In assorted ways did the just one subdue the stubborn ones
and with assorted contrivances did they break the yoke of his words.[43]
A harsh yoke was the harshness of the words of the prophecy
and skillfully did it subdue man with the reverence of truth.
Choice among cultivators was Elijah through his prophecy
and because he worked hard, he rested in the harbor which is beyond fear.
In the harbor of peace which is beyond fear did the diligent one (come to) rest
and he prepared the way for those who worked pleasingly that they go with him.
Upon the level way without obstacles did the righteous one go,
that which was paved by Enoch the just in the pleasantness of his soul.
The pleasingness of soul of that pleasing one did the Creator see
and He preserved him alive that the pleasingness of his soul not be corrupted.
In that very pleasingness of pleasing things did Elijah please
and He did towards him that which was done towards the pleasing one.
Of one (and the same) remuneration did He deem the pure of soul worthy
and He didn't give[44] voracious death a chance at their bodies.
Beyond death did He exalt the good servants
in order to raise zeal in the minds of men that they be good.[45]
Men did He teach, through the two men whom He translated to His side
not to doubt about the surety of the revival of the dead.[46]
The repository of life did he intend to reveal to man
and He showed it beforehand through the two men, Enoch and Elijah.
Enoch and Elijah became guides for man's nature
that men go upon the way of immortal life.

---

[41] 1 K. 18,39.

[42] 1 K. 18,16–40.

[43] Cf. Cyrus, p. 18,14–27.

[44] BCDE: "and there was no chance for voracious death".

[45] Cf. Cosmas, V, 83 (Wolska, II, p. 127), Diyarb., p. 52,16–18, Išo‘dad, p. 109,9–10 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 90,17–19.

[46] For Elijah as a pledge and surety cf. Cyrus, p. 19,6–9.

Enoch did He translate in the first interval of ten generations
and the son of the settlers in the second, which is the middle period.
In the middle period did He enact the translation of the good servant
so that he call to mind earlier and later events.
Into three periods did the Lord of the world divide the world
and in each period He took one man and preserved him alive.
In that first one He translated Enoch the just man
and in the second He conducted Elijah the tried prophet.
In the third – beyond us is the word about him
and no mouth is able to say how glorious his translation was.
As on an elevation did His will go at the end of time
And He elevated man from base to glorious things.
Less perfect was the period in which He translated Enoch than that of Elijah
and lowlier was that of the son of the settlers than that of Christ.
(About) Enoch who was translated He only mentioned his translation
but He did not disclose to us how He translated him and where He placed him.
Symbolically did Moses hint to us about his translation
but he did not explain to us the reason for which he had been translated.
As to children did he brabble those things pertaining to Enoch
in that the way of life of the beginning period was childish.
Much more childish was Enoch's period than that of Elijah
and less perfect were the modes of the (one) translation than the (other) translation.
A simple voice did the earlier generations hear in the story of Enoch;
as for that of Elijah, the multiple voices of prophecy.[47]
Multiple voices were telling about Elijah
that the time was near when he would be translated from man's side.[48]
One prophet was telling his fellow the news which he had received
and they were transmitting their revelations from one to another.
From one to another was the day of his translation being transmitted
while they were weaving for him the crown of praises of their revelations.
With the voice of revelation was the athlete of the spirit being praised
and the prophets of the spirit were celebrating his valor.
Valiantly was he going to be translated from one place to another
and while knowing he concealed the day of his translation.
The chaste one did not want to reveal his gloriousness
so that the cunning snares of vainglory not trap him.
Wisely did he arrange that which would be accomplished
until the spirit of revelation of the heralds disclosed it.

---

[47] Cf. Cyrus, p. 119,22–120,12, Diyarb., p. 52,15–18, Išo‘dad, p. 109,7–10 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 90, 16–19.

[48] 2 K. 2,3.5

The spirit of revelation was forcing him as well to reveal hidden things[49]
and while unwilling he revealed the time[50] when he would be translated.
Designedly he construed pretexts for his disciple:
that the Lord had sent him on a mission symbolically.[51]
Symbolically was he showing him the symbol of his translation
as is seemly for those familiar with divine symbols.
God of the universe was instructing the good servant
to set the order for the translation of immortal life.
To life without corruption was the mortal one being translated
and wisely he venerated it before mortals.
Upon an expansive way without milestones[52] was he going to go
and he expanded his mind according to that infinite expanse.
Through the eye of the spirit the seer saw that delight
and the world was as (if it were) no world in his mind.
Another world did he see in an immaterial vision
and he spurned all things and loved that which doesn't become corrupt.
He saw how great was the way of life to which he was being translated
and he marvelled and was amazed at his Lord's love - at how much He loved him.
His Lord's love did the true one see - how great it was -
and how much He made those of His household triumph through glorious things.
Glorious was the day when the son of the settlers was glorified
and magnificent were the modes of revelations of the course of his way.
A wonderous vision did he see depicted above earth
a kind of fiery chariot travelling through the air.[53]
Horses of fire did he see harnassed to wheels of fire
and standing above them a fiery driver.
A fire in a fire did he see which was bound by reins of fire.
and he was amazed at the greatness of the glory shown to him.
At the greatness of the glory of the day of his translation was he amazed
and he was not sated with looking properly at pleasant things.
He saw as much as man is able to see spiritual things
and he ceased wondering and turned to talk with his disciple.
He revealed to him openly, "Truly I am being translated"
and he commanded him to ask that which is seemly for a teacher to give.[54]
"Ask me," said the learned teacher to his disciple,
"and take something which will remain with you and make you triumph."

---

[49] 2 K. 2,9; cf. also 1 K. 18; 19,15; 2 K. 1,15.

[50] BCDE: "and he didn't want to reveal that time".

[51] 2 K. 2,2.4.6.

[52] For the use of this term in Ephrem cf. Beck, "Meilensteinen".

[53] 2 K. 2,11.

[54] 2 K. 2,9.

His disciple asked for a double level of prophecy
and his teacher instructed him how to ask and how to take.[55]
The asker asked and the giver gave, two in one
and the prophet began to go upon a way unseen by him.
He of dust sat upon the spiritual chariot
and clasped in his hands the reins of fire and was not burnt.[56]
Spiritually was the spirit yoked to him of dust
and the body was conducting the spirit and the spirit the body.
Through the spirit was the prophet of the spirit flying to the place where he was going
and it was thought that he was being raised up on high.[57]
On high was the Hint prodding him to go
not to heaven, but to a place higher than earth.
Not to heaven did Elijah ascend on the day[58] of his translation
but rather to where Enoch, member of his race, had been translated.
That very Hint which had translated Enoch translated him as well
and in one place did He enclose them that they be united.
One was the cause for which they were translated from man's side
and in one place and in one company was it seemly that they be.
In glory alone did He make a distinction when they were being translated
according to the way of life (progressing) from childhood to maturity.
Childish was the period in which Enoch the pleasing was translated
and less perfect were the modes of his translation than those of Elijah.
More mature was the time of the son of the settlers than that of Enoch
and more glorious were the images on the day of his translation as well.
Through spiritual images did He distinguish them
in order to reveal to man the distinction which would come about at the end.
The day of perfection did He depict in the appearance of the translation of the just ones

---

[55] 2 K. 2,9-10.

[56] 2 K. 2,11.

[57] According to Pesh. 2 K. 2,11, Elijah was raised up to heaven, as opposed to LXX reading "as if to heaven". The latter is reflected in Cyrus's use of *'a(y)k da-l(')appay šmayyā* with regard to Elijah's ascension, which he interprets as "not to heaven but towards heaven", for Christ alone entered heaven (Cyrus, p. 154,8-12). Išo'dad, III, p. 129,10-12, says that "to heaven" means "on high" and notes that the Greek has "as it were towards heaven", employing the same words as Cyrus (*'a(y)k da-l(')appay šmayyā*). So too Theod. b. Koni, p. 90,20-91,4. A similar problem arises when Paul (2 Cor. 12,2f.) says that a certain man rose up to the third heaven. Dadišo' (p. 276,21-277,3) writes that according to Theodore Paul was taken up to Paradise. This would agree with the interpretations of Cyrus, Išo'dad and Theod. b. Koni. Cf. Van Rompay, "Eznik de Kołb et Théodore", p. 174.

[58] E: "ascend by means".

and the more so in the day of the translation of the son of the settlers.
On high above was He going to cause the race of man to ascend
and He depicted that ascension beforehand in the translation of His servant.[59]
On high was fixed the gaze of the course of that chariot
to where all nature was going to be raised up.
For this purpose is it said that the son of the settlers ascended
not that he ascended but in order to depict the symbol of ascension.
The symbol of ascension did He depict in the appearance in which he was translated
for thus will the nature of mortals ascend, according to the symbol of his ascension.
The way of life did the just ones, Enoch and Elijah, pave for us
and they came to rest in the harbor of immortals at the end of the way.
Alive without corruption were they preserved in the place to which they had been brought
and in a natural way life was maintained in that which was imperfect.
In that which was imperfect did the just ones live in the place where they were
through the force of that spirit for whom even difficult things are easy.
Through the force of His Commandment, earthly beings were preserved on earth
while not overcome by the difficulties of earthly beings.
In that very nature full of harm were they maintained alive
and it is a wonder that they were not weakened by harmful things.
It is a great wonder how they lived the lives of men
yet were not troubled by the turbulence of troubling waves.
In them were the modes of turbulence, agitators of men
but that Commandment which had translated them quieted these.
That Commandment quieted in them the modes of turbulence
and they did not give up occupation with glorious things.
Glorious was their occupation and seemly the course of their way of life
and who suffices to recount the contemplation in which they were constant.
Ineffable is the contemplation which those who contemplate properly contemplate
and Paul, who once went and listened to their occupation, testifies.[60]
With that occupation of immortals did the mortals occupy themselves

---

[59] Cf. Cyrus, p. 153,14–29.

[60] 2 Cor. 12,4.

and with the immaterial beings they praised with spiritual voices.[61]
Like spiritual beings are earthly beings going to be
and He first translated two bodily beings for the assurance of the universe.
For the assurance of the universe did He translate the two men
so that through their translation He assure man of future things.
As deposits of peace did He accept the pure of soul
so that the peace of men towards the Creator would last.
A weak nature is the nature of mortals from the beginning
and inordinately are they accustomed to err through (their) desires.
The hateful error of their minds did the All-seeing One see
and He took from them two pledges to be at His side.
As a sign of peace did He translate them from man's side
so that men preserve love for His hiddeness.
The peace of man were the two true ones assuring at all times
and He strengthened it through the beneficent contemplation of their minds.
The image of man did He love and does He love still, He who loves man
and by all means this is what he wants: that men live.
For the life of man He spared two mortals from death
so that through their lives they remind men about their lives.
To all of nature was immortal life promised
and witness to this are the two guarantees, Enoch and Elijah.
And like[62] guarantees were their lives for our mortality
so that we not give up certainty of the promised life.
Life without corruption did the Beneficent One prepare for the nature of man
and He wrote it in the two books and (through) three witnesses.
In the first book Enoch and Elijah avow it
and in the second, one guarantee and tried witness.
A tried witness did the Creator try among mortals
so that he attest to the benefits of those of his race.
For the testimony of men was all the testimony on earth
and thrice are they accustomed to seal a bill of debts.[63]

---

[61] The question of whether or not Enoch and Elijah met bodily is raised in Diyarb., p. 52,18–21, but left unanswered. In any case, they perceived things with the mind (*ibid.*, 24–25). Cf. Theod. b. Koni, p. 91,5–12 and 94,13–14; Išo‘dad, p. 109,12–21. Išo‘dad further asks whether the two ate or not (p. 109,21–29) and quotes Narsai as saying they met and even occupied themselves with the angels (p. 110,1–2). In his commentary on Kings (Išo‘dad, III, p. 131,7–16) Išo‘dad explicitly states that Enoch and Elijah met and were occupied with spiritual things yet ate of the fruits and manna in Paradise because they lived a mortal way of life. The latter remarks as well as the quote from Narsai seem to accord with st. 348.361–366 of the homily under discussion.

[62] BCDE: "Like".

[63] Dt. 19,15; Mt. 18,16; 2 Cor. 13,1.

A bill of debts did the Creator write out between himself and man
and He sealed it according to the earthly and heavenly order.
Three witnesses did He make witness to the bill of our lives
Enoch, Elijah and thirdly Christ who is of us.
Christ who is of us sealed the bill of our lives with his blood
so that the promise of life be assured for all his race.
Through his death he liberated us from servitude to evil and death
and through His resurrection he promised us immortal life.
He became immortal in nature after his death
so that his life be a tried witness for the race of man.
For the life of man did the Creator choose that man
and He exalted his rank to the exalted rank of His divinity.
It was not by the (very) order of His divinity that He named his rank
but rather by the order of that ordering which is incomparable.
Incomparable is that rank to which the head of our race arose
and his ascendancy cannot be compared to that of fashioned beings.
Not as a servant did He make him, that he become great in portions
nor did He make his translation like that of Enoch and that of Elijah.
Enoch and Elijah He translated from man's side
and caused them to dwell in another place which was on earth.
On earth did the earthly beings Enoch and Elijah dwell
and in mortal nature were they preserved on earth.
The place of Eden did the true ones enter to reside
where Adam, head of all our race, had dwelled.
The second Adam breached the wall which was before man[64]
and he caused men[65] to enter the place which had been fenced off by the sentence.[66]
By the sentence were men being excluded from that place
until one man undid it and assured men.
One man, Christ who is of us, entered it first
and he gave entrance to it to all men through the(ir) soul.[67]
Enoch and Elijah alone had entered in body and spirit
and remained in it until the time of he who makes time pass.
He who makes time pass entered it first in spirit and not body
and He (then) departed from it and ascended to a place more seemly than it.
To the place on high, higher than on high did our firstfruits ascend

---

[64] Eph. 2.14.

[65] BCDE: "them".

[66] Cf. Theod. b. Koni, p. 91,8-11 and Išoʻdad, p. 109,12-14.

[67] A discussion concerning who enters Paradise prior to the resurrection may be found in Theod. b. Koni (p. 91,18-92,2). Išoʻdad limits entrance to the righteous (p. 109,15-16).

to the Holy of Holies in which no man had set foot.[68]
Before the (Divine) Essence did the priest who is of us enter to minister
in the place which is purified of harmful things and those causing harm.[69]
With His own blood did He minister at one time among earthly beings[70]
and the offering of His holiness sufficed on behalf of all creatures.[71]
On behalf of all creatures did the Creator choose Him from among creatures
and He accepted His death as (a means of) redemption on behalf of mortals.
The iniquity of man had stained the world with shameful things
and the Beneficent One turned and purified it through the death of one man.
Through that very thing in which death had entered and corrupted man
life entered and abolished death from humanity.[72]
Adam paved the way of death through the desire for fruit
and death passed unto all of the Adamite nature.[73]
The transgression of the commandment subjugated man to the service of death
and man despaired of the human race ever living again.
For the hope of man did the Creator choose three men
and He made them witnesses testifying to the life of man.
To the life of man do Enoch and Elijah testify on earth
and the firstfruits of our lives in heaven above assures our lives.
The two true ones testify on earth to our renewal
and one in heaven ratifies the words above and below.
Two as servants supplicate on earth - Enoch and Elijah -
and one as king abides in heaven and commands on earth.
Not with[74] the servants did I reckon the king who came to rule from among us
nor his sovereignty as the sovereignty of earthly beings.
Not as an ordinary man did I call him man
nor his translation as the translation of fleshly beings.[75]

---

[68] Heb. 9,11.

[69] Heb. 8,1-2.

[70] Heb. 9,12.

[71] Heb. 10,10.

[72] 1 Cor. 15,22-23.

[73] Rom. 5,14.

[74] BCDE: "as".

[75] Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 208,4-15) explains that if Enoch and Elijah's excellence led to their translations, "how much more is it fitting that Christ not die for He was loftier than all men". He adds (*ibid.*, p. 244,6-15) that because Christ repaid the debt and was in no way worthy of death, His translation was not like that of Elijah and Enoch. For their translations were to their advantage alone. Cyrus (p. 77,23-30) likewise distinguishes between Christ, whose benefit was not confined to Himself, and Enoch and

Let the heretics not reprove as they are accustomed
for I am not accustomed to allow room for their reprovals.
I know that they construe arguments like trappers
and it has not escaped me how shrewd they are in trapping words.
Words do the trappers of words of faith trap
and upon having trapped them, they fly as birds from their hands.
Our faith cannot be trapped by the hands of the foolish
for they do not suffice to grasp its meaning in their minds.
They are much too weak to engage in battle openly
and the course of their statements is feeble in understanding.
They are unable to trap words with words as they think
or even to provide clear argument about hidden things.
Hidden from them is the sound word of faith
and once revealed through the mouth of the knowing, they are astonished and amazed.
The sound word of faith have I recounted even now
and it does not escape me that they stumble over it ignorantly.
No, ignorant ones, I have not ordered my words foolishly
they do not instruct you in that you are not instructed by the instruction of words.
You do not know to go[76] upon the way of faith
and the words set in its meanings do not reach you.
Without understanding do you stumble as upon rocks
and you are not discerning enough to distinguish between the hateful and the worthy.
Rightly I said in the history which I told about man
that a man was He who was exalted beyond man.
A man was He who proclaimed hope for mankind
and ratified[77] the voices which Enoch and Elijah sowed on earth.
A man was He who ascended and ruled in heaven above
and paved the way for men to become heavenly beings.
A man was He who became a witness to the bill of our lives
and swore and ratified it with His blood that it not be falsfied.
A man was He and once more I say that a man was He
and if the heretics are angered, let them cry out exceedingly.
Let them cry out exceedingly until their head, Legion, hear
and wail with them like that voice which was before our Lord.[78]
Bitterly did Legion wail on account of his fall
and greatly does the voice of the disciples resemble that of the master.

Elijah, whose rescue from death benefitted no one but themselves. Cf. Ez. 14,14-20.

[76] "Instruct" of the previous stich and "go" are of the same verbal root (*rd'*).

[77] Corr.

[78] Mk. 5,5-10; Lk. 8,28-31.

The foolish master do the foolish heretics resemble
and they do not discern that they are convicted by the sound of their (own) words
A mole do they resemble for they delve at all hours into evil contemplation
and upon listening to the voices of the word of truth they are furious and enraged.
The sound of their fury doesn't permit me to resign from them
nor does it allow me to pass them by without warning.
Like a mark is their mind set before my thoughts
and it urges me to strike them with the arrows of my words.
With words do I desire to strike them at all times
for they do not resign from argumentation against my words.
In the contemplation of words I had a thought to be considered
and while I contemplated it the voice of the heretics hindered me.
"Resign from me, men", I cried out to them in all manners
and while I thought that resigning is what they were doing, they were (to the contrary) perturbed and went wild.
Their perturbation have I seen now as well in this history
and I abandoned my word that I rebuke the words of their blasphemies.
The blasphemy of blasphemers does my word recall
and I have abandoned its word and gone forth on the way against the stubborn ones.
The stubborn ones have I admonished in an exchange of words
and the uninstructed have I instructed with the argument of truth things.
Truthfully have I spoken true things
what the cause is for death's not having been sovereign over men who are of us.
Men who are of us have I seen raised up beyond death
and I composed words in order to reveal with words those things which are not revealed.
Unrevealed things have I sought to tell the listeners
and inform them so that they know the varieties of hidden things.
Varieties of hidden things were hidden in the history of those which I recounted
not from the perfect but from the childish and unknowing.
For the unknowing have I revealed the causes of the translation of men
what the cause is for their having been translated from us to another place.
To a different place were Enoch and Elijah translated from us
and through their translation they depicted for us the type of the translation of our lives.
New life did He promise us, He who loves our race
and He ratified it with the three seals of three men.
Three men did I call the three of them
not according to rank but according to the order of the nature of man.
The nature of the three of them is one in body and in spirit;

the rank is not equal in that servants do not resemble a lord.
Servants are Enoch and Elijah however much they remained alive;
Christ who is of us is Lord of all however much he is man.
Enoch and Elijah are preserved on earth until the resurrection;
Christ is in a place more exalted and more lofty than the mortals.
An immortal one is He in that He became immortal
and He alone received this on behalf of mortals.
On behalf of mortals did the Creator choose Him from among mortals
so that He fulfill the order of servants and of free men.
The self same one is a servant in that He is one made by the Maker
and he is Lord as well in that He took on divine rank.
Divine is He because of His rank which is exalted over all
and He became great and ruled, not through His nature but through His rank.
In rank did that man of our humanity become great
and all this was because He who took good pleasure in Him willed it.[79]
God of the universe wished to call Him by the name of His greatness
and lo! enraged are foolish men by the greatness of our rank.
Forsooth, foolish ones! Why are you pained by our exaltedness
and do not wish to accept the king who is of us?
Forsooth, men! Rejoice, for you have become divine beings
through a man who became God with God.
In a man who is of us did the Word, Son of God, dwell[80]
and He called him by His name and gave him the rank of the name of the (Divine) Essence.
Titles did He give Him as well as deeds which are more exalted than He
and although He gave them to Him He did not forget that He is of us.
Of us is He and on behalf of our lives did He ascend and become exalted
and we need confess the Beneficent One who exalted our race.
Confession of the Beneficent One let the entire nature of mortals utter
for He exalted our race through one man whom He took[81] from us.

---

[79] Mt. 3,17; Mk. 1,9; Lk. 3,22.
[80] Jo. 1,1-2.
[81] D: "assumed".

Homily II

On the Flood

Homily II

On the Flood[1]

Refrain: Blessed is He who, instead of the earthly dwelling,
gave us in His grace the heavenly dwelling.

My brothers:

Wise and glorious is the Creator
who out of nothing fashioned all
and showed His force in His works
for He spoke and they came into being.[2]
Hidden was His wealth in His knowledge
prior to the fashioning of His creatures
and His love revealed His will
and He poured upon all His favour.
In a (specific) arrangement did He fashion all things
and He made nothing deficient
in that in His nature He is perfect
perfect is His fashioning and whole.
The time was determined in His knowledge
as to when He would create the creatures
and hidden was the term
along with the hiddenness of His nature.
He revealed His hiddenness in His works
and showed His force in His fashioning
and the assemblies on high called out to Him
"Glorious is the Creator in all which He created."[3]
Through the fashioning of His works
He taught rational beings
that one is the Force which fashioned all
and nothing came to be without it.
It is one body which He made and composed
for rational and mute beings
and He bound His entire fashioning

---

[1] A: "By the Same (Author). Homily Sixteen. On the Flood. To be Said on a Fast Day"; BCE: "Another by the Same (Author). On the Flood"; D. "Another by the Teacher Mar Narsai. On the Flood"; AI add in the margin: "Homily 16. On the Flood"; D adds in the margin: "8".

[2] A reference to God's commanding things to come into being, commencing with light on the first day (Gen. 1,3).

[3] Ps. 145,10; 103,22.

in the composition of Adam's image.[4]
He made the image[5] a mirror
that His fashionings look at it
that in a manifest image they might see
His hiddenness which is incomprehensible.
In His image He taught rational beings
how much He loves His fashionings
and in the sentence for the offense
He showed that He is a lover of justice.
He chastised Adam who defied the commandment
and rejected Cain on account of his having murdered
and He showed His love and His justice
in that He chastises and nurtures and does not destroy.
He showed them His justice
in that He hates iniquity and sin
and He showed them His beneficence
how much He loves the penitent.
As babes He raised them
on meager things like milk[6]
and through sentence and threat
He brought them near to knowledge.
With the rod of the transgression of the commandment
He lashed the simple
and the pain of regret
taught them that which is proper.
The Merciful One consoled them
through spiritual revelations
while descending to them
in degrees and likenesses.[7]
Through one who made his ways pleasing
He returned them to His love
and through the hope of his translation
He tempered the bitterness of the angry.
Through Enoch who was pleasing and was translated
He showed His love towards them
for it was not nature which He hated
but iniquity and sin.[8]

---

[4] For man as the bond of the universe see above Hom. I, st. 13 and accompanying note.

[5] BCDE: "His image".

[6] 1 Cor. 3,1-2; Heb. 5,12-13.

[7] Heb. 1,1.

[8] So too Cosmas, V, 83 (Wolska, II, p. 127) where Enoch's translation is said to prove that death was not imposed on man because of anger but in order to make him hate sin and desire justice. Elijah's ascension (*ibid.*, V, 141; Wolska, II, p. 205-207) likewise shows

Alive He preserved the righteous one
that He proclaim through him the abolishment of death
and through his translation He promised life
to which there is no end.
He showed them His love in Enoch
for they had contemned the hope of His promises
and through the iniquity of their deeds
they drove Him from compassion to anger.
In Enoch He stayed His justice
and changed His anger to tranquility
but through the wickedness of desires[9]
they sharpened His sword for exaction.
The iniquity of man increased on earth[10]
like the waters of the abyss
and it was inundated entirely with sin[11]
prior to the inundation of justice.
With bodily desire they burned[12]
and confounded the order of nature[13]
and as wild beasts among each other
they gored and mauled each other.
Like raging stallions
they lusted each other's wives[14]
but not a woman her partner
nor a man his mate.[15]
They went out of the way
in the desire which desired gain
and covetousness like garments
did their minds don.
The flood of sin grew strong
and evil rose up like a mountain
and the tide of iniquity was like the sea

---

how much God honors human nature and punishes in wisdom without ire.

[9] Gen. 6,2. According to Theodore (Jansma, p. 69, fol. 19r,2-3) men became enslaved to their desires so that they came to live without God's solicitude.

[10] Gen. 6,5. The term iniquity (*'awlā*) occurs not in Gen. 6,5, which has evil (*bīštā*) but in Gen. 6,11.

[11] Gen. 6,11.

[12] Cf. Theodore (Jansma, p. 70, fol. 19r,12-13).

[13] Gen. 6,1-4.12.

[14] Jer. 5,8.

[15] This interpretation is based on Gen. 6,2, "they took for themselves such women as they chose". So too Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,15-21) who says that after the Sethites went astray, their wives too relinquished their chastity. Cf. the parallel passage in Išo'dad (p. 112,1-17) attributed to Ḥenanā.

which removed the peace of humanity.[16]
The mist of error spread
and covered the face of the inhabited world
and the rays of light of the eyes of intelligence
100 flickered and were extinguished.
In the sleep of iniquity were they sunk
and they sensed not that while sinning
and while their mind was not asleep
asleep were faculties along with limbs.
105 One alone did not sink
in the sleep of iniquity along with the evil ones;
because the faculties of his soul were vigilant
he expelled the sleep of sin.
Noah alone kept his mind pure
110 and did not defile his body with iniquity
for like oars his faculties served him
and he did not sink in sin.
The mud of the iniquity of the covetous ones[17]
did not trouble the lucidity of his soul
115 nor did he stumble when walking
in the gloom amidst the evil ones.
The faculties of his mind served him
as wings for the weight of his limbs
and discernment bore him
120 above the waves of sin.
And because he had preserved lucidity of mind
and had kept his soul pure from iniquity
he became worthy of spiritual revelations
which disclosed the wickedness of the evil ones.
125 In revelations He spoke with him
and attested to the purity of his soul
and He disclosed to him that with a flood
He was going to purge the earth of iniquity.
"The evil of man has stained
130 the seemly garment of creation
behold I am going to purge it with a deluge
and purify its filth.[18]
You alone have kept your thoughts
pure from hateful things

---

[16] Is. 57,20–21. BCDE: "which removed the mark of humanity".

[17] Is. 57,20.

[18] Gen. 6,13.17. The wording of Išo'dad, p. 110,16 is remarkably similar to st. 131-132: "I will purge the world from their filth" (*l-'almā ašig men ṣā'utā d-hānon*).

135 and your mind has not been defiled
by the mire of the earth's iniquity.
Because you did not mingle your love with the evil ones
in occupation with earthly things[19]
you alone will be saved
140 from the exactions of justice."[20]
He revealed and disclosed to the upright one
concerning the wickedness of those of his people
"behold justice is going to wipe out
the mire of their deeds."[21]
145 He revealed to him the iniquity of the sons of Seth
who had mingled with the daughters of Cain
who had been separated one from the other
by the sentence of the Creator.[22]
The offspring of righteous Seth[23] mingled
150 with the stock of Cain the murderer
and lofty ones descended to lowliness[24]
for they had fellowship with iniquitors.
The look of the eye[25] trapped
the rational ones and ensnared[26] them
155 and the beauty of lovely faces
corrupted the beauty of their understanding.[27]
"The sons of God saw

---

[19] Noah is thus like Enoch and Elijah who occupied themselves with spiritual thoughts. See above, Hom. I, st. 359–366.

[20] Gen. 7,1.

[21] Gen. 6,13.

[22] The "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" of Gen., 6,2 are identified by Narsai with the Sethites and Cainites respectively. This identification, linked to a divine prohibition for the two to mix, is common. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 53,29–54,6), Theodore (Jansma, p. 69–70, fol. 19r,2–6.9–11), Diyarb. p. 54,4–7.11–13 and Theod. b. Koni p. 184,19. Both Ephrem (*ibid.*, p. 54,1.18.20) and the Syriac translation of Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 70, fol. 19r,6) use the same root (*ḥlṭ*) as Narsai for the mingling of the two groups. For the application of the term "sons of God" to men in general see Theodore (Tonneau–Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p. 86, fol. 22v,7–15; p. 332–334, fol. 84r,23–25; and Devreesse, p. 14,n.2).

[23] Seth's descendants, according to Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 42) were considered just and as such called sons of God (Gen. 4,26; 6,2), because they separated themselves from the descendants of Cain. So too Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,30–55,3; 56,1–2) and Išo'dad (p. 111,28–29).

[24] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,17–18) uses similar terms: "and they were brought down (*w-mettaḥtēn*) from their place which was loftier (*da-mrayyam*) than that of Cain".

[25] Gen. 6,2.

[26] Corr.

[27] Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,3–4) and the parallel in Išo'dad (p. 112,1–4).

the daughters of men, that they were beautiful
and they desired them and took them[28]
and they gave birth to giants [29] of iniquity."
It is not the greatness of measure
which the Creator wished to disclose;
the greatness of iniquity He[30] recorded for us
for they had become giants in evildoings.[31]
The beauty of the daughters of Cain opened
the hateful source of sin
and inundated the sons of the righteous one
with the flood of bodily desire.
The daughters of the murderer mixed a drink
and they[32] intoxicated lucid ones with its dregs
and they troubled the intellect of the wise
by means of the mead of their faces.
And in that the exalted ones abandoned their dwelling places
and descended to the earth of groans
the iniquity of their deeds ascended
and caused justice to descend to earth.
Because they did not remain in the vicinity
of the seemly dwelling of Paradise
the flood of iniquity swept over them
and evil increased on earth.[33]
"And He regretted that He made men[34]
for they had corrupted and ruined His arrangements"[35] [...][36]
It was not that regret[37] overtook Him,
the possessor of the sum of all knowledge!

---

[28] Gen. 6,2.
[29] Gen. 6,4.
[30] Corr.
[31] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 57,2-20) considers the offspring of the two to be large in size, resembling the Sethites. So too Išo'dad (p. 112,11-14) who calls them demiurges. Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 43) remarks that only sinners or strangers are called giants. Diyarb. (p. 55,24-26), Theod. b. Koni (p. 102,10-13) and Išo'dad (p. 111,21-24; 114,21-22), like Narsai, say that "giants are those giants in iniquity and wickedness ... and not those long of body".
[32] BCDE: "it".
[33] Gen. 6,5.
[34] Gen. 6,6.
[35] Gen. 6,(11-12). This may be an echo of an explanation preserved in Diyarb., p. 56,5-7: "I created them for seemly things and they turned to the practice of hateful things". The same explanation is offered by Theod. b. Koni (p. 100,15-17) and Išo'dad (p. 116,12-14).
[36] Two or more stiches are missing.
[37] In st. 81 the root *twḥ* occurs while here *tw'* is used. Both are attested by Pesh. mss. for Gen. 6,6.

For their remorse did He cause a voice to be heard
that they perhaps turn away from iniquity.
Voices filled with threat
were being spoken to them
so that the sleepers who were sunk in sin
would awaken, if possible.
As a trumpet did resound
the voice of the Creator in their ears,
"Behold I will wipe off the earth
men who have confounded my arrangements."[38]
The end had come upon the earth[39]
and a decree of anger went forth
and He caused a voice to be heard, "Henceforth
my spirit will not dwell among man forever."[40]
The voice spoke again for a second time
to serene Noah[41] and told him
to make an ark of wood
that he conceal himself in it at the flood.
"Make yourself an ark of boxwood[42]
and daub it with pitch[43] so that it not sink
so that it withstand the tempests
once waters mingle with waters."
He showed him its length and breadth -
how he make its dimensions
and He taught him the division of stories
necessary for him and the animals.
"Make the length three hundred cubits
and the breadth fifty cubits
and thirty cubits its height[44]

---

[38] Gen. 6,7.
[39] Gen. 6,13.
[40] Gen. 6,3.
[41] Serene (*niḥā*) is one possible etymology of the name Noah (*noḥ*). Narsai presents another in Hom. III, st. 19.22 below: he who brought relief (*'aniḥ*). In Hom. 5, ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 28r, wrath and the lashing of the earth rest because of Noah's serenity. In Hom. 19, ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 318r, mankind rests from its laborious life through Noah. Both meanings of Noah's name are found in Diyarb. (p. 53,4-6) and Išo'dad (p. 110,2.6-7). Theod. b. Koni (p. 184,18) presents the first only while Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,13-17) bases his explanation on Pesh. Gen. 5,29, "this one will comfort us".
[42] The translation of *'arqā*, the equivalent of MT גפר in Pesh., is uncertain.
[43] Gen. 6,14.
[44] Gen. 6,15.

and beams[45] within its stories.[46]
There shall be three stories[47]
so that all species live in it:
wild beasts and cattle
and birds of wing and man."[48]
Hail the Lord who bears the universe
who teaches the righteous ones devices
for while He was able to save him
He instructed him in (providing for) the sustenance of his life.
He was able to preserve the upright one
along with the rest of those whom He maintained alive
and it would have been simple for Him to protect
all things without an ark.
For the repentance of the impudent ones
did the fashioning of the ark come to be
so that through a manifest sign they be reproved
and condemn their acts.[49]
With the hewing of silent wood
He wished to instruct rational beings
that the living ask the dead
why they were being hewn.
Dumb ones were calling out
to rational ones, "Repent from iniquity,
for lo, in our fashioning is being proclaimed
repentance, if you wish".
As a herald was the voice
of the production of the ark crying out,[50]
"Arise, shake off the burden of your debts
o sleepers who are sunk in sin."
Superfluous to them were
the voices of the fashioning of the ark
for the burden of evil had stopped up
hearing which admits understanding.
Noah alone had heard
and was waiting for the end

---

[45] The translation of *zwednē* is uncertain. According to Diyarb. (p. 57,5–9) and the parallel text in Išoʿdad (p. 11,22–26) they are either beams which protrude from the ark for provisions or beams for crossing from one side of the ark to the other.

[46] Gen. 6,16.

[47] Gen. 6,16.

[48] Gen. 6,18–20. This appears to be a combination of Pesh. "birds, cattle and reptiles" (Gen. 6,20) and LXX "all animals, reptiles and wild beasts" (Gen. 6,19).

[49] Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 58,30–31).

[50] Cf. Ephrem, (Tonneau, p. 59,9–10).

while the impudent mocked him[51]
for his fashioning was not given credence.
The upright one built himself a house
according to the Hint which had instructed him
and revelation spoke with him[52]
that he prepare provisions.[53]
He brought in and heaped up sustenance
for himself and for the species of all things
and while the Hint was preserving him
it taught him to provide for his needs.[54]
It was not food of satiety
which the righteous one gathered and heaped up
for he knew that insufficient would be
the food without the Hint.
Scantily were they supplied
for the subsistence of their bodies
and the Hint of the Creator's force
preserved them in the scarcity.[55]
Noah did as he was commanded[56]
and the Creator spoke with him:
"Go into the ark, you and your sons
and your sons' wives along with yours.[57]
Bring in animals with you
and cattle along with birds
to keep seed alive on earth
that species will continue in succession.[58]
Bring in male and female
two by two of the unclean species
and clean ones seven by seven
together male and female."[59]
The upright one did not know

---

[51] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,5–6.12).

[52] Diyarb., p. 56,16–23 and Išoʿdad, p. 117,7–10.

[53] Gen. 6,21.

[54] This theme is found in Narsai, Hom. 23 "On Elijah" (Mingana, I, p. 183) and Išoʿdad, III, p. 122,18–20. According to the latter, God tells Elijah to eat because even if God helps man and lightens the burden of earthly things, things remain in their nature (i.e. humans remain humans).

[55] Narsai, unlike Diyarb. (p. 56,16–32) and Išoʿdad (p. 59,16–21), does not explain how they were preserved, e.g., by making them sleep.

[56] Gen. 6,22.

[57] Gen. 6,18; 7,1.

[58] Gen. 7,2–3.

[59] Gen. 7,2–3.

280 how to distinguish between unclean and clean
until the Commandment showed him
by means of an enumeration of all species.[60]
He multiplied and brought in the clean ones
which would be needed by him once he went forth
285 for He would permit him to eat meat
and raise up sacrifices from them.[61]
Hail to the Hint which gathered the species
brutal and wild
and reconciled them to each other
290 and subjugated them before Noah.
That very Hint which caused them to pass
before Adam while silent,[62]
subjugated and harnessed them
with the yoke of the word of the upright one.
295 They assembled species by species
for the Commandment was prodding them
and they were coming male and female
clean and unclean while tranquil.
The bits of peace were placed
300 in the mouths of the animals and they were silent[63]
lion and ox were harnessed
with the yoke of the Hint of the Creator.
He bowed the bird's wings
and it descended from the height to the deep
305 and doves and hawks sped[64]
towards the door of the ark.
A great peace reigned
at the door of the righteous one's house
in that[65] species (normally) consuming each other
310 in love embraced each other.[66]

---

[60] Cf. Theod. b. Koni, p. 104,18–105,5 and the parallel in Išoʻdad, p. 117,3–6 and 118,24–26.

[61] See below, st. 788.

[62] Gen. 2,19–20. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 30,27–31,2) for the animals' peacefulness prior to the transgression in Paradise. Išoʻdad (p. 118,19–24) seems to be a paraphrase of Narsai: "that very Commandment which brought them and drew them near to Adam, gathered them before Noah without any effort on his part".

[63] Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,11).

[64] The combination of the animals in st. 301–305 reflects Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,28–60,6) in a slightly abbreviated form.

[65] BCDE: "and".

[66] According to Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,5–6), those of the generation of Noah were convinced neither by the gathering of the animals at one moment nor by the love which grew among them in one instant.

With Noah was renewed the sovereignty
of honor of Adam's image
in that species which had defied Adam
reverted to being subjugated to Noah.
315 The Hint went forth as an envoy
and gathered them from all places
and harnessed in concord[67]
conflicting species and they were pacified.
He set the limit at seven days[68]
320 until the animals be assembled
in that manner in which He fashioned all
and rested from His labor on the seventh.[69]
There He protracted His fashioning
for the instruction of the assemblies on high[70]
325 and here He was longanimous[71] to show
that He is not desirous of destroying.
One hundred years long Grace
cried out as a herald,[72]
"Sinners, turn from iniquity
330 before justice goes forth."
After a prolongation of years
He set the limit at seven days
for during the hundred years and the seven (days)
He had been awaiting repentance.[73]

---

[67] Corr.

[68] Gen. 7,4.

[69] Gen. 2,2.

[70] This theme occurs frequently in Narsai's creation homilies, e.g. Gignoux, II, 338–371; III, 107–112.209–222.

[71] The same term (*'aggar)* may be found in Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,12–13) followed by Išoʻdad (p. 120,21–22).

[72] According to Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,9–10) it was Justice which proclaimed (*'akrez)* the flood one hundred years whereas for Narsai Grace is the herald (*kārozā*).

[73] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,9–10), Theod. b. Koni (p. 105,14–15) and Išoʻdad (p. 120,21–22) concur that God was longanimous for the sake of the sinners' remorse or repentance. There is disagreement among the commentators as to the length of the respite granted prior to the flood. God commanded Noah to build the ark at the age of five hundred (Gen. 5,32) and it was completed when he reached the age of six hundred (Gen. 7,6.11) so that one hundred years had passed. Yet God had said that men would live to be one hundred and twenty (Gen. 6,3). Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 60) followed by Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,19–30), Cosmas (II, 41 and V, 89; Wolska, I, p. 347–349 and II, p. 135–137) and Išoʻdad (p. 114,14–17) claim that God reduced the number of years in order to lessen iniquity, Cosmas adding that they would have died anyway. Theodore (Jansma, p. 70, fol. 19r,13–28), Diyarb. (p. 55,4–18), Theod. b. Koni (p. 103,13–104,17) and Išoʻdad (p. 114,6–9.11–14) are of the opinion that God did not reduce the number of

"Seven days hence
my decree will be fulfilled in deed[74]
and I will hold back Grace
within the ramparts of Justice.
Seven days hence
I will close the gate of my compassion
and I will breach the sea[75] which is collected
above the surface of the firmament.[76]
In the five hundredth year He disclosed
a revelation to Noah about this[77]
and in the six hundredth year of his life, fulfilled was
the term which He had fixed.[78]
In the six hundredth year of Noah's life
Justice sharpened the sword
and with the arms of water it defeated
the entire force of the inhabited world.
In the six hundredth year of Noah's life
the sea passed beyond its confines[79]
and the pool above changed
inordinately in its descent.[80]
In the six hundredth year of Noah's life
the deluge came upon earth[81]
and Noah and his sons and their wives[82] entered
and all species of animals.[83]
The sound of water stirred up
the inhabited world above its populace
and the roar of the waters above[84]
covered its surface with darkness.
Noah and those with him were awaiting
that Hint which had gathered them

---

years to one hundred for it is punishment which He tends to reduce and not the chance to repent. Therefore God first spoke to Noah in his four hundred and eightieth year.

[74] Gen. 7,4.

[75] Gen. 7,11.

[76] Diyarb. (p. 59,3-5) attributes this opinion to Rabban, Basil and Ephrem. Išo‘dad (p. 119,28-120,3) rightly includes Narsai. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 75,n.4.

[77] Gen. 5,32.

[78] Gen. 7,6.

[79] The exact wording is to be found in Išo‘dad, p. 120,1.

[80] Gen. 7,11. Comp. Diyarb. p. 58,21-59,3.

[81] Gen. 7,6.

[82] Corr.

[83] Gen. 7,7.

[84] Cf. Is. 17,12-13; Ez. 1,24.

that it close the door of the ark
with the key of the Hint of His Force.
A wonder was that entrance [...][85]
that they be protected from the flood.
Rational ones despised the voices
and scorned the work of the ark
and dumb ones believed that if they'd enter
the flood would not overcome them.
They were all even when entering
male and female together
and there entered neither more
nor less than the (set) number.
The impudent ones were looking at
the species gathering before Noah's door
(but) they did not consider why
they had left the wilderness and loved cultivated land.[86]
In all these things the Creator proclaimed
repentance in the ears of the stubborn:
in the fashioning of the wood of the ark
and in the gathering of the beasts of the field.
One hundred years long revelations,
like trumpets, were crying out
and in the likeness of the rod of chastisement
the voice of the flood was resounding.
And at seven days
did He set the limit for the decree of their lives –
"Seven days hence"[87] –
but the heart of the sunken sensed not.
Noah entered and caused the animals to enter
as the revelation had commanded him[88]
and the Hint closed the ark[89]
and the Force of the Creator sealed it.
Dumb beings entered and those endowed with speech remained behind
for they had become dumb willingly
and Justice rebuked them
through the mute ones who obeyed the Commandment.
And after seven days,
in the six hundredth year of Noah's life
in the second month the voice of Justice

---

[85] Two or more stiches are missing.

[86] Comp. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,28-29; 60,5-7).

[87] Gen. 7,4.

[88] Gen. 7,13-16.

[89] Gen. 7,16.

resounded in the inhabited world.[90]
And on the seventeenth in number
He noted the terror of the sentence
and over all ranks went forth
the verdict of exaction.
And the wells of the abyss burst forth
and the flood gates of the height were opened[91]
and with the sword of water the Hint
slayed the entire population.[92]
The waters of the deep ascended on high
and those above descended to earth[93]
and with the net of water Justice
ensnared the iniquity of the evil ones.
The abyss was encountering its fellow
and floodgates were pressing floodgates
and waters were calling out to waters,[94]
"Strike the heads of the impudent ones."
Bellowing was the dumb abyss
as one endowed with speech while ascending
and with the voice of its waves it was rebuking
rational ones who had scorned the commandment.
The upper pool was bringing suit against
the evil ones with the voice of its descent
for iniquity had caused it to descend from on high
to earth and had troubled its serenity.
Waters were pressing waters
while ascending on high
and those above encountered those below
like envoys of Justice.
The voice of the Commandment was impelling
those above to descend to earth
and the awesome Hint was pressing
those below on high.
The descent and ascent of the mute ones
were indicting the rational ones
for while dumb they obeyed the commandment
and ascended and descended for exaction.

---

[90] Gen. 7,10–11.
[91] Gen. 7,11.
[92] Gen. 7,21–23.
[93] Išoʿdad, p. 120,2, employs very similar wording.
[94] Cf. Ps. 42,8.

The earth was filled with weeping[95]
and the mountains with the sounds of groans
and lamenting were the heights and the deep
the doleful death[96] of all ages.
Infants were exhausted
when their lives were terminating
and they were supplicating their parents
but there was none who helped the afflicted.[97]
They ascended on high
and the flood caused them to descend
and they descended towards the deep
and the abyss bellowed at them.
From this side and that did the battle of water
confine the weak
and no survivor remained sound
of the entire force of humanity.
Thus forty days, night and day
rain descended upon earth[98]
and the abyss ascended upwards
while waters were pressing waters.
In forty days did the waters reap
the field of darnels
and with a harsh sword they cut off
the stiff neck of iniquity.
In forty days did the Hint
pluck the desolate vineyard
and waters, like those who tred the winepress,
trampled upon humanity and beasts.[99]
The abyss in its ascent proclaimed
the great force of the Creator
for His Hint had shaken it
and it rebuked rational ones.
The waters grew mighty above the earth
and the high mountains were covered[100]
and beasts and cattle perished
and birds of wing and men.[101]
Water destroyed all ages

---

[95] Corr.
[96] Corr.
[97] Cf. Is. 63,5.
[98] Gen. 7,12.
[99] Cf. Is. 5,5–6; 63,3.6.
[100] Gen. 7,19.
[101] Gen. 7,21.

resounded in the inhabited world.[90]
And on the seventeenth in number
He noted the terror of the sentence
and over all ranks went forth
the verdict of exaction.
And the wells of the abyss burst forth
and the flood gates of the height were opened[91]
and with the sword of water the Hint
slayed the entire population.[92]
The waters of the deep ascended on high
and those above descended to earth[93]
and with the net of water Justice
ensnared the iniquity of the evil ones.
The abyss was encountering its fellow
and floodgates were pressing floodgates
and waters were calling out to waters,[94]
"Strike the heads of the impudent ones."
Bellowing was the dumb abyss
as one endowed with speech while ascending
and with the voice of its waves it was rebuking
rational ones who had scorned the commandment.
The upper pool was bringing suit against
the evil ones with the voice of its descent
for iniquity had caused it to descend from on high
to earth and had troubled its serenity.
Waters were pressing waters
while ascending on high
and those above encountered those below
like envoys of Justice.
The voice of the Commandment was impelling
those above to descend to earth
and the awesome Hint was pressing
those below on high.
The descent and ascent of the mute ones
were indicting the rational ones
for while dumb they obeyed the commandment
and ascended and descended for exaction.

---

[90] Gen. 7,10–11.
[91] Gen. 7,11.
[92] Gen. 7,21–23.
[93] Išo'dad, p. 120,2, employs very similar wording.
[94] Cf. Ps. 42,8.

The earth was filled with weeping[95]
and the mountains with the sounds of groans
and lamenting were the heights and the deep
the doleful death[96] of all ages.
Infants were exhausted
when their lives were terminating
and they were supplicating their parents
but there was none who helped the afflicted.[97]
They ascended on high
and the flood caused them to descend
and they descended towards the deep
and the abyss bellowed at them.
From this side and that did the battle of water
confine the weak
and no survivor remained sound
of the entire force of humanity.
Thus forty days, night and day
rain descended upon earth[98]
and the abyss ascended upwards
while waters were pressing waters.
In forty days did the waters reap
the field of darnels
and with a harsh sword they cut off
the stiff neck of iniquity.
In forty days did the Hint
pluck the desolate vineyard
and waters, like those who tred the winepress,
trampled upon humanity and beasts.[99]
The abyss in its ascent proclaimed
the great force of the Creator
for His Hint had shaken it
and it rebuked rational ones.
The waters grew mighty above the earth
and the high mountains were covered[100]
and beasts and cattle perished
and birds of wing and men.[101]
Water destroyed all ages

---

[95] Corr.
[96] Corr.
[97] Cf. Is. 63,5.
[98] Gen. 7,12.
[99] Cf. Is. 5,5–6; 63,3.6.
[100] Gen. 7,19.
[101] Gen. 7,21.

of youth and of old age
in that equal were their deeds
480 the waters equated their deaths.
All species did the flood
gather and bury in one grave
and with the garment of water it covered[102]
humanity and beasts.
485 Noah and those with him were saved
of all who had the breath of life in them;[103]
it was the Hint who preserved their lives
and not mute wood.
The abyss bore the ark
490 and caused it to ascend on high by its waves[104]
and it was transmitted on the waters[105]
and the Commandment clasped it.
It passed over hills
above the height of those dashed down
495 and tempests were knocking it
yet its structure was not disturbed.
The waves were tossing under it
yet it passed over them serenely
and shaking it from side to side
500 was the strong blowing of the wind.
Water and air
pounded each other inordinately
and in their struggle the ark
remained in peace and rest.
505 The abyss bore it and ascended
and carried it on its shoulder
and waves bowed before it
and made way for its course.
Hail ship without oars
510 which passed over sea and dry land
without the captain having navigated it
into the turbulence of the tempests.
Hail boat which bore
the whole world in its entirety
515 yet its course did not need
sailors to navigate it.

---

[102] Corr.
[103] Gen. 7,22-23.
[104] Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,11-13, explains that the water raised up the ark so that it traveled likes boats on a river.
[105] Gen. 7,17-18.

The Hint became its sailor
and the Commandment its captain
and instead of a star, the Will
520 was navigating it into the harbor.
By the anchor of faith
was its course bound
and Grace abided in it[106]
instead of wind in the sails.[107]
525 Forty days in darkness
it travelled as if in light[108]
for the sailor who stood at its helm
was not in need of a luminary.
At the completion of forty days[109]
530 Justice withdrew its sword
and on the one hundred and fiftieth (day) was seen
the sign of compassion at the top of the mountains.[110]
After one hundred and fifty days
the Hint went forth like an envoy
535 bearing the letter of peace
which Compassion had addressed[111] to Anger.
The waters rested on the one hundred and fiftieth day[112]
and the tops of the mountains became visible[113]
and the Hint reproached the mute ones
540 and gathered them into the abyss.[114]
One hundred and fifty days long
the ark passed through the sea
and its[115] course was directed at
a position in the middle of the earth.
545 From a place close to Eden[116]
it embarked at the beginning of its course
and concluded its voyage

---

[106] Corr.
[107] For the imagery used in st. 513-524, see Murray, *Symbols of Church*, p. 249-253.
[108] Corr.
[109] Corr.
[110] Gen. 8,3.5.
[111] Corr.
[112] Gen. 8,1.
[113] Gen. 8,5.
[114] Gen. 8,2.
[115] Corr.
[116] The notion that after the transgression in Paradise, men lived just outside of Eden may be found in Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 36), Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 57,13-15), Theodore (Tonneau, p. 54,16-17 and Petit, *Chaîne*, no. 465), Diyarb., p. 45,4-8 and 60,12-14 and Išo'dad, p. 91,23-24. This is perhaps based on LXX Gen. 3,23.

on the top of the mountains of Qardu.
The Commandment of its construction too
was looking to the completion of the voyage
that it transfer the lineage of the house of Adam
that they bring peace[117] to the center of the earth.
On the other side of the sea did dwell[118]
that generation which corrupted the earth
and until that moment, unseen[119] was
the middle of the earth by mortals.
The sea had been fenced off before them
until the deluge came about
and the Hint breached its fence
and transferred them to the center.
In the vicinity of Paradise
did ten generations dwell
and the whole earth was empty
of humanity and animals.
And it was as a desolate place[120]
from sea to sea
and the voice of man had not spoken in it
nor had the foot of animals tread upon it.
For this very purpose did Grace
fashion the ark
that it serve as a bridge for the house of Adam[121]
and transfer them[122] to open spaces.[123]
On account of the flood they paved
the way upon which no man had passed
while it had (already) been determined in the mind
of the Maker that He would do this.

---

[117] Or "cultivate". BCDE: "constitute".

[118] Cosmas, IV, 7-8 (Wolska, I, p. 543-547), explains in detail the separation of Eden from the rest of the earth by the ocean.

[119] Unseen, ἀόρατος, is used by LXX to translate MT תהו ובהו in Gen. 1,2. Narsai uses the same term in Gignoux, III, 116-118. Cf. Cyrus, p. 107,29-108,1.

[120] Desolate is one of the terms used by Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 9,15.21) when explaining *toh w-boh* of Gen. 1,2. For the juxtaposition of the terms used by LXX and Ephrem, see Diyarb. (p. 7,22-8,1) and the parallel in Išo'dad (p. 13,24-26; 14,1-4). The latter adds the term "empty" as in st. 563 above, attributing this interpretation to Aquila (*ibid.*, p. 14,4).

[121] See below, Hom. IV, st. 32.

[122] In a passage in Išo'dad (p. 110,16-26) parallel to both Diyarb. (p. 53,16-27) and Theod. b. Koni (p. 98,19-99,8), Išo'dad substitutes the words "He transferred them" (i.e. the inhabitants of the ark) for "He introduced (*'a"el*) them".

[123] Gen. 34,21. So too Diyarb. (p. 53,21-23), Theod. b. Koni (p. 99,1-3) and Išo'dad (p. 110,18-20).

Not in wrath did He expel them[124]
from the place in which they had resided
nor out of regret did He cast them
into the place which is the middle of the inhabited world.
Beforehand was this treasure
in His knowledge, prior to the creatures
and He brought it out into the open by various means[125]
for the instruction of mortality.[126]
And as for this too, that He destroyed
and inundated His fashionings with water -
it was not anger which compelled Him suddenly
while He was unaware of what He was doing.
He knew prior to the deluge
those things which had been and would be
and He was well aware concerning His fashioning
that death would enter and undo it.
Iniquity corrupted His fashioning
while it did not escape His knowledge
for not yet having created the sinners
He knew that sin they would.
He knew He would reserve a remnant
of humanity and all species
and so He ordered and brought
into the ark pair by pair.[127]
He knew that it would be inherent
to the thought of the impudent ones
that it was because He despised His fashioning
(that) He destroyed it and made another.
Into the mind of the sowers of falsehood
did He look before He destroyed
and He crushed beforehand the crop
of darnel of their thoughts.
Of the first fashioning
He reserved a remnant of all things
in order to show that not evil was

---

[124] Cosmas V, 89, 92, 94 (Wolska, II, p. 135; 139-141) explicitly states that the flood was not the destruction of wrath or regret on God's part.

[125] That God makes use of various means in order to instruct man is a common theme in East-Syrian exegesis. Theod. b. Koni (p. 170,1-21) has even devoted a question as to why God fulfills His Economy through the use of causes.

[126] Cf. Cosmas (above, st. 577), Diyarb. (p. 53,20-21.23-27) and the parallels to the latter in Theod. b. Koni (p. 99,3-8.13) and Išo'dad (p. 110,20-26).

[127] According to Theodore (Jansma, p. 75, fol. 21v,9-13) and Išo'dad (p. 118,15-16) two of each species sufficed for their perpetuation.

the fashioning which His hands had made.[128]
At all things which came to be did He look
before they came into being
and it was not out of regret that He destroyed all
and then because of His compassion had mercy and spared (a remnant).
And He showed (both) His love and His justice –
for just is the Good One in His deeds –
and He showed that He was just while chastising
so that they not think that He is a lover of iniquity.
And He mingled compassion with His justice
so that they not call Him a cruel one [...][129]
In both He showed His force –
in that He chastised and in that He spared –
and He proclaimed the sovereignty of His Lordship
that His will chastises His own.
With the moist shoots of water
He lashed the iniquity of the impudent ones
and with the very rod that crushed the evil ones
He preserved the order of life.
Water bore the remnant
which Compassion delivered from anger
and it transferred it and placed it in the middle
so that its seed flourish in all directions.[130]
In the seventh month the ship
entered and came into the harbor
and on the seventeenth in number
it rested on the mountains of Qardu.[131]
In the second month it embarked
on the seventeenth from its place[132]
and in the seventh month it entered
the harbor on the seventeenth.[133]
Seven months in the harbor
was it bound and preserved
and it did not open the treasure of its wealth
until the second month.[134]

---

[128] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 58,12–14) similarly notes that had there been a blemish in God's fashionings, He would have created a new creation rather than preserve that which caused Him regret.

[129] Two or more stiches are missing.

[130] Gen. 8,17.

[131] Gen. 8,4.

[132] Gen. 7,11.

[133] Narsai follows the Pesh. as opposed to LXX according to which the ark both embarked and landed on the twenty seventh.

[134] Gen. 8,14–16.

In the second month the master of the ship
sent an envoy
to go out and see whether the wrath
of the waters had subsided from the earth.[135]
An unclean raven[136] was sent
voracious and a lover of food
and the desire for flesh took it captive
and it did not return to give answer.[137]
He sent a second envoy
of the species which loves peace[138]
and the dove went out and inspected
the habitation and returned to him.[139]
He waited yet another seven days
and he sent an envoy once more
and the dove came bearing
the tidings of peace in its mouth.[140]
It showed him an olive branch[141]
which the Hint had sent to him through it
as a pledge of reconciliation
that the wrath of the judge had subsided.
The righteous one rejoiced, being consoled
by the letter of peace which it delivered
and he sent the envoy once more
for he saw that it confirmed its mission.
Three times did the dove go forth
and assured him each of the three times
and he opened the door of the ark
and he saw land[142] and was consoled.
He saw light and heard a voice

---

[135] Gen. 8,6–7. The "subsiding of wrath" may be inspired by LXX κεκόπακε (were calmed) as opposed to the Pesh. *qal(w)* (were diminished, receded). In any event, the words "to (go out and) see" occur only in LXX at Gen. 8,7 and are repeated in Gen. 8,8 where they do appear in Pesh.

[136] The raven is included in the list of unclean birds in Lev. 11,15.

[137] Gen. 8,6–7.

[138] For the contrast between the voracious raven and peace-loving dove, cf. Narsai, Hom. 1 (Mingana, I, p. 4) and Hom. 2 (Mingana, I, p. 32) on Gen. 15,9. So too Theodore (?) (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 186,16–30), Diyarb., p. 74,18–21, Theod. b. Koni, p. 131,19–22 and Išo'dad, p. 150,2.8–10 on Gen. 15,9.

[139] Gen. 8,8–9.

[140] Gen. 8,10–11. Išo'dad (p. 121,20–29) summarizes the various reasons why the dove bore an olive branch. Aside from being a sign of fecundity, a sign of the dryness of the land and useful for a nest (so too Diyarb., p. 60,4–6) it was also a sign of God's love and of peace. The last listing is probably derived from Narsai.

[141] Gen. 8,10.

[142] Gen. 8,13.

through spiritual revelations,
"Lo, Compassion has become mediator
and appeased the wrath of the Judge.
Lo, Grace has persuaded Him
to open the door before you;[143]
go out, o prisoners, and be consoled
by the lovely sight of land."
After the six hundredth (year) of Noah's life[144]
at the end of the following year
the Hint commanded the righteous one
to go out upon the land along with those with him.[145]
"Go out, you and your sons with you
and your wife along with your sons' wives
and bring out with you birds
and cattle and wild beasts."[146]
The just one received the commandment
and went out and brought out all species
and none remained of those confined
who did not go out to the place of the living.
According to the number which had entered it
did they go out of it complete
for the Hint had preserved them all
and had sustained their lives.
Those imprisoned went out rejoicing
because of the sustaining of their lives [...][147]
In the second month the Commandment
confined them in prison
and in the second month He opened
the door of compassion before them.
On the seventeenth in number
Justice buried them
and on the twenty seventh of Iyar[148]
Grace resurrected them.
In Iyar He made the deluge
with the elements of dryness
lest the impudent ones think

---

[143] According to Išo'dad (p. 121,6-7), it is written that Noah opened the door yet it is clear that the one who opened it is the one who closed it.

[144] Gen. 8,13. The words "of Noah's life" may be found in LXX but not in Pesh.

[145] Gen. 8,15-18.

[146] Gen. 8,16-17. Narsai follows the wording of Gen. 7,7 as opposed to that of Gen. 8,16 where Noah is told to exit with his wife and his sons with their wives.

[147] Two or more stiches are missing.

[148] Gen. 8,14.

that (simply) an abundance of rain had occurred.[149]
In Iyar[150] He brought about the exodus
in the month which is lovely and adorned
so that at the sight of seeds[151] and fruit
He gladden the heart of the suffering.
Hail depth of the great wealth
of wisdom of God of the universe
for He prepared for His fashioning
a season suited for its pleasure.
In Nisan He fashioned the creatures
and adorned the earth with trees
and men and animals discovered
a bridal chamber lovely and adorned.[152]
In Iyar He opened the ark
in the (very) month in which He closed it before them
and He prepared a table of provisions -
a lovely season for them.
In Nisan He brought out from Egypt
the assembly of the house of Israel
and He set up a bridal chamber in the field for them
and wove a crown of flowers for them.
In Nisan, moreover, He renewed
the creatures through our firstfruits
so that at the time in which He fashioned them
He renew the corruption of His fashioning.
At the resplendent time towards Noah as well
did He complete and perfect His will
and brought Him out in the month of flowers
and gladdened everything along with him.[153]

---

[149] The same reasoning may be found in Theodore (Jansma, p. 74, fol. 21r,7-11) (who adds that the receding of the water in the winter was also unusual), Diyarb., p. 59,22-23, Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,15-16, and Išo'dad, p. 117,20-21 and 121,3-4. Both Narsai and Diyarb. make use of the root *gdš* (a simple or accidental occurrence).

[150] For the identification of the second month of Gen. 8,14 with Iyar cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 76,n.9.

[151] BCE: "seed".

[152] Cf. Ephrem (Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, I.6, VII.15.24, XIII.3.10). For the imagery of the bridal chamber, see Murray, *Symbols of Church*, p. 254-257.

[153] Theodore (Jansma, p. 74, fol. 21r,20-28 and 21v,2-8), like Narsai, links the exodus from the ark with the creation in Nisan. Narsai himself (McLeod, I, 199-202 and V, 355-358) connects the time of Mary's conception with the earth's conception of Adam. Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 15) links the creation in spring with the renewal of the world through Christ's crucifixion in the spring and Cosmas (V, 1-2; Wolska, II, p. 13-15) sees the exodus from Egypt on the first day of the first month (i.e. Nisan) as the shadow of the liberation and reconstruction of the world through Christ's resurrection. At this same time the world was created and renewed (after the flood) and Mary conceived. For the

All species went forth with Noah
and dwelt with him upon earth
and he offered the firstfruits from among them
to the Hint which had preserved their lives.
Noah built an altar of will(ingness)
and offered up sacrifices of reconciliation[154]
and the Creator accepted his sacrifice
along with the promptitude of his will.[155]
The Being who is in need of nothing
smelled the smell of the burnt offering[156]
and the Nature who is never angered
subsided from the wrath of His anger.[157]
"I will never again curse
the earth because of mankind
for I know that his inclination is set
on evil from the time of his youth.[158]
Henceforth, all the days (there will be)[159]
seed and harvest and produce
summer and winter while progressing
in the order of their seasons."[160]
He blessed the earth with the seasons
when it yields fruit for man
and as for men, He blessed them
with conception and birth of posterity.[161]
"I will place your fear upon all,
upon animals and cattle
and with the yoke of the sovereignty of man
I will thus harness all species."[162]

---

significance of Nisan, see Brock, "Months".

[154] Gen. 8,20. According to Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,13–15) "Noah will comfort us (Pesh. Gen. 5,29) through his offer which reconciles God".

[155] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,4–5) attributes this acceptance to Noah's sincerity (*šapyutā d-lebbā)* and Īšo‘dad (p. 122,12–13) to his purity and faith.

[156] Gen. 8,21.

[157] The smell is called *riḥā da-nyāḥā*, a sweet or pleasant smell in Pesh. Gen. 8,21. The word(s) "subsided (from his wrath)", *'ettniḥ*, is a play on the aforesaid and occurs as well in Diyarb., p. 60, 25–27 followed by Īšo‘dad, p. 122,8–10.

[158] Gen. 8,21. This would seem to be a combination of Pesh., "for the inclination of man's heart is evil from his youth", and LXX, "for man's thought has attached itself (i.e. is set on) carefully to evil from his youth".

[159] There is no verb in st. 757–760. Pesh. and LXX read "will not cease" at the end of Gen. 8,22.

[160] Gen. 8,22. The reason God says this, writes Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,11–12) is because in the year of the flood seed and harvest had ceased and its seasons (*ṭukkāsēh*) were disturbed.

[161] Gen. 9,1.

And along with the blessings of childbirth
and sovereignty over all things
He taught them that as grass
they might eat the flesh of animals.[163]
He showed them discernment
(as to) how to slaughter animals
that after having spilled their blood upon the earth[164]
could they then eat their carcasses.
"Blood alone you shall not eat
for blood is the soul of the cattle;[165]
do not eat flesh along with the soul
so that you not be subjected to exaction."[166]
The first generations were not wont to
eat the flesh of animals
until the Commandment revealed
to Noah "eat" and thereupon he ate.
The promise became law
which He imposed on nature
and had the earlier generations known it
Noah would have kept it even more.[167]
In His having imposed the law upon him
He showed that the law was new
and if it had been imposed upon the earlier generations
He would not have been renewing His covenant.
By means of the killing of animals
He warned them against killing[168]
for he who kills man
instead of man will his blood be shed.[169]

---

[162] Gen. 9,2.

[163] Gen. 9,3.

[164] Lev. 17,13. The connection is made in Diyarb., p. 61,17–19;22 and Īšo‘dad, p. 124,1–3 as well.

[165] Gen. 9,4.

[166] Gen. 9,5.

[167] Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 40) states to the contrary that men were allowed to eat meat from the start. For Abel made sacrifices and ate meat and was considered just. Cosmas (II, 39–41; Wolska, I, p. 345–349) seems to counter Eusebius's arguments when stating that men did not eat meat but offered animals, as did Abel, to procure blessing for dairy products and use the fat for fuel. He adds (V, 91; Wolska, II, p. 137–139) that after the expulsion men were not even allowed to eat from the trees and only after the flood were fruit and meat available to them. Diyarb., p. 61,13–15, Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,18–23, and Īšo‘dad, p. 123,18–23 agree that permission to eat meat was granted after the flood. Īšo‘dad, in addition, closely reproduces st. 787–792. Cf. Theodore (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 20) on Gen. 3,12 where the tunics God made for Adam and Eve are said not to be of skins because they were not allowed to eat meat.

[168] Cf. Diyarb., p. 61,15–16.19–24, Theod. b. Koni, p. 108,4–10 and Īšo‘dad, p. 123,27–124,8.

Man is the image of his Creator[170]
and lord of all creatures
and according to the greatness of his honor
is the harshness of exaction of his killer.[171]
New laws did the perfect teacher
impose upon His disciple
and the Hint of His will wrote them
upon his heart with a pen.
He entered moreover a covenant with him[172]
and affirmed the peace with adjurations[173]
"I will no more wipe mankind from the earth
with the waters of the flood.[174]
This is the sign of the covenant
which I am convening between myself and the earth:[175]
the vision of a bow appearing
in the midst of the waters in the clouds."[176]
This sign came into being
along with the fashioning of all things
yet He had not wished to show it to the earlier generations
until He revealed it in the days of Noah.[177]
To Noah He gave it as a sign of peace
which would be until the end of time
so that upon seeing it, mortals
be consoled by the sign of peace.[178]

---

[169] LXX Gen. 9,6.

[170] Gen. 9,6.

[171] Cf. Išo'dad, p. 125,3-8.

[172] Gen. 9,9.

[173] Is. 54,9.

[174] Gen. 9,11.

[175] Gen. 9,12.

[176] Gen. 9,13.

[177] Here too the commentators are divided. Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 49–50) says that the rainbow was natural and did not come into being suddenly as some claim. For a sign need not be new or exceptional as proven in the case of Moses (Ex. 3,12). Išo'dad, p. 126,12–19, insists that the rainbow was new while Theod. b. Koni (p. 106,20–22) only says that it hadn't been seen before, otherwise it would not appear as new. Theodore (Sachau, p. 30,15–22) is of the opinion that nothing new came into being after the sixth day of creation. So too Diyarb., p. 22,25–29 and Išo'dad, p. 49,29–50,12, who even adds that neither Eve, nor the tunics made for Adam and Eve nor the bow in the clouds was new. Cf. Diyarb., p. 88,23–89,6, Theod. b. Koni, p. 135,4–8 and Išo'dad, p. 175,10–17 for discussions of whether or not the ram in Gen. 22 was a new creation and Brock, "Genesis 22", p. 15–17.

[178] Cf. Diyarb., p. 62,10–16, Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,25–107,5 and Išo'dad, p. 126,3–5;22–27. See below, Hom. IV, st. 1–60 for a more extensive description of the function of the rainbow.

He instructed the simple
with the new laws which He wrote
and conferred upon them the understanding
to cultivate the barren earth.
"Noah commenced work
and planted a vineyard and it yielded fruits
and he drank of its wine and became drunk[179]
and he erred through it in the newness of its force."
He hadn't (yet) experienced
that drinking it leads the mind astray
and he did not know how
its drinkers use it.[180]
Noah drank and forgot himself
and wine debased the honorable one
and the impudence of will
of licentious Ham mocked him.[181]
The just one cursed the impudent one
on account of his having mocked him without shame
and he harnassed him with the yoke of servitude
in order to frighten others through him.[182]
With the curses directed at the impudent one[183]
he caused dread to dwell in many
so that they not be like Ham the cursed
and become cursed in his likeness.
Not in nature did the word of the just one
bind him in servitude
for there is no servitude in nature
but in the depravity of will.[184]
Ham's will sneered at
the honorable one who had erred through his wine
and he made him a sign for the impudent
that they be put to shame by honorable ones.
The Creator noted the story

---

[179] Gen. 9,20–21.

[180] Cosmas II, 38–39 and V, 86 (Wolska, I, p. 345–347 and II, p. 131–133), Diyarb., p. 63,8–10 and Išo'dad, p. 127,19–21 say that Noah was the first to cultivate the vine. Cosmas stresses Noah's inexperience. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 63,8–10) is of the opinion that men drank wine prior to the flood but adds that six years had passed since Noah last drank it.

[181] Gen. 9,21–22.

[182] Gen. 9,25.

[183] Corr.

[184] God, according to Diyarb., p. 64,20–25, knew that men would establish slavery in their wickedness and revealed His prescience to them. So too Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,17–22 and Išo'dad, p. 129,21–28.

of Noah the honorable one who was exposed
in order to instruct the knowing through him
that they not pride themselves on wine.
Along with the purity of his members
He noted the error which he erred through wine
in order to highly warn that in moderation
its drinkers use it.
He showed that he was worthy of revelation
because he preserved lucidity of mind
in order to incite pure ones through him
that the living word abide in them.
He noted for us the triumph of his constancy
how he persevered against the evil ones
for he was not seduced by pleasures
in society with his fellows.
He preserved him in the waters of the deluge
and made him a replacement for creation
and He pacified the desolate earth
with the footsteps of the succession[185] of his lineage.
He brought him forth from within the ark
and concealed the ark from him
so that his offspring not err in it
and call it by the name of God.[186]
For this purpose did Justice
conceal it from observers
that the cause of life not become
the cause of error for others.
In the earth did He conceal the ark
in the manner which He acted with Moses[187]
for He knew that the people of the Hebrews
would err concerning his grave.[188]
To the Possessor of the sum of all wisdom
is the knowledge of all things seemly
for those things which were and are going to be
do not escape His knowledge.
He discloses all things beforehand
and before a thing exists He knows it

---

[185] BCDE: "those of his lineage".

[186] Theod. b. Koni (transl., p. 118,n.9) says that the ark was hidden like Moses's grave or even concealed by Moses himself so that none be considered God on account of it.

[187] Dt. 34,6.

[188] This is the third reason provided by Theod. b. Koni, p. 169,3-12 and Išo‘ b. Nun, Q. LVI, fol. 26r,14-26v,12 for Moses neither having died in the presence of the Israelites nor having been buried by them.

and in His knowledge are enclosed
His fashionings before they come into being.
Worthy of being praised by all
is that Knower of all things
for while knowing the depravity of our will[189]
He restrains us by various means.[190]

---

[189] Gen. 8,21.

[190] BD add: "The End". Cf. Diyarb., p. 60,28-61,3, Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,11-16 and Išodad, p. 122,14-16.

Homily III

On the Blessings Which Noah Gave His Sons

Homily III
On the Blessings Which Noah Gave His Sons[1]

The symbol of benefits towards man have I seen in the scriptures
which the prophet discloses through the spirit symbolically.
The spirit of revelation made a revelation to the son of Amram spiritually
so that he reveal to men the mystery which was hidden in their members.
In their members was hidden the mystery of their liberation
and along with their succession was it being transmitted from one to the other.
In them was placed the repository of life according to their needs
and in their life force the life in them was being preserved.
The life force of life did the Creator mix in Adam's clay[2]
so that upon his becoming corrupt He would bring his mortality to life in his life.
Along with his clay the life force which was from his members flowed
until it became a source of immortal life.
Mysteriously it flowed hiddenly before onlookers
and while they saw, they did not see the force of its life force.
Dimly it showed its flame in Adam and in Seth
and after a while in Enoch and in Lamech and in Noah his offspring.[3]
In Noah was disclosed the force of the life force which is in the nature of man
and in him were tempered the sentences of Paradise.[4]
Lamech prophesied that through Noah the tormented world would be relieved[5]
and through his purity he would purify the earth from its curses.
Effectively the word of his father was fulfilled in him
for he gave relief to the earth by means of the blessings with which he blessed his sons.

---

[1] AHI: "Another by the Same (Author). Homily Fifty One. On the Blessings which Noah Gave His Sons".

[2] God did this by blowing the breath of life in Adam, Gen. 2,7. Cf. Gignoux, I, 157-166; III, 267-272; IV, 9-10.

[3] Cf. Diyarb., p. 53,1-3.

[4] According to Theodore (Jansma, p. 75, fol. 21v,3-8) a second fashioning took place through Noah which was parallel to the first fashioning but in which the honors given man were increased. So too Cosmas, V, 90-90 (Wolska, II, p. 137-139).

[5] Gen. 5,29. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,13), Cosmas, II, 37 (Wolska, I, p. 343-345), Diyarb., p. 53,7-8 and Išoʿdad, p. 11,3-4 regard Lamech's words as prophecy. The name Noah may mean "repose" or "he who brings repose". See below, st. 22 and Hom. II, st. 200 above and Cosmas, *ibid.*, Diyarb., p. 53,4-6 and Išoʿdad, p. 110,2. Theod. b. Koni, p. 184,18, has "repose" only.

A tabernacle of peace were his members for the peace of man
and he preserved the life of his fellow man from harmful things.
25 In the harbor of his body the transmission of the repository of life came to rest
and he gave it to his sons that they transmit it to those afterward.
Wisely he preserved the treasure of his forefathers' house
and through understanding he opened up its hiddenness before his offspring.
The Spirit instructed him to preserve its wealth with care
30 and It taught him moreover to establish his sons over its resources.
Its force reenforced the weakness of the faculties of his soul
and caused a speech of righteousness to well up from his mind.
As channels did his members become for the flow of the spirit
and in the likeness of streams he distributed the words of the blessings.
35 Streams of words flowed from the mouth of the spirit
and the hearing of the sons of his loins took the place of the earth.
A good seed did the righteous one sow in his sons' field
and he was zealous that they receive it in purity of soul.
Pure was his heart and straightforward was the word of his mouth
40 and in joy he raised his voice to bless.
"Blessed is the Creator," cried the he of the household of faith
"who strengthened my faculties to bless my offspring in His name."
"Blessed is He who stored in me wealth which sustains the work of His hands
and made me a source which causes life to flow to mankind."
45 "Blessed is He who revealed in me His benignity, that He loves man
and disclosed through my hands the truth of His name, that He is God of the universe."
"Blessed is He who breached through me the fence of wrath which was between Him and His works[6]
and made live through my life natures both mute and endowed with speech."
"Blessed is He who established me as a mark of peace before onlookers
50 that they resemble me in calling His name[7] in purity of soul."
"Blessed is He who made dwell in me the force of the wise designs of His divinity
which made well up from my mouth a speech which acquires life for man."

---

[6] Eph. 2,14. See above, Hom. I, st. 41.

[7] Perhaps a reference to Pesh. Gen. 4,26, "then he began to call upon the name of the Lord" in as much as Noah was a descendant of Enosh.

"Blessed is He who made me the second Adam for the Adamites[8]
and resembled in the disposition which He enacted towards me, that of the beginning."
55 "Blessed is He who created in me the second creation out of that which had been
so that the world would go forth according to the disposition of His creative force."
"Blessed is He who established me in the exalted rank of His foremost image[9]
and extended my rule over the creatures in his likeness."[10]
Too feeble is my tongue to bless the name of His (Divine) Essence
60 which acquired for my mind the understanding of future things."
With the future did the just one[11] bless the sons of his womb
on account of that did he bless the name of his God and then his sons.
"Blessed is the Lord God of Shem"[12] – lo this is future
and why "of Shem" and not your own,[13] o righteous one?
65 You take precedence over your offspring, just father;
upon you first was placed the name of your God and then upon your offspring.
New is that which you did, just son of Lamech, in the symbol of your[14] blessings
and perhaps the disclosure of something new is being disclosed in it.
"Blessed is the God of Shem", the prophet of truth prophesied
70 and he made his sons share in the greatness of wealth which he bequeathed to his son.
"Japheth, may He amplify and may he abide in the tent of Shem the elder";[15]
and "Ham, may He make a servant to his brothers and may he toil for them."[16]

---

[8] See above, st. 18 and additionally Cosmas, V, 94 (Wolska, II, p. 141) and Cyrus, p. 80,25–28 for Noah as a second father and those with him as a substitute for the first creation.

[9] Narsai uses this same term for Adam. See, e.g., Gignoux, I, 450.

[10] Gen. 9,2. Noah regains the control over the animals which was lost after the transgression in Paradise. This idea is widespread, cf. Theodore (Jansma, p. 68, fol. 17r,10–22) for the loss of control and for its reinstatement Diyarb., p. 62,1–4, Išo'dad, p. 124,20–22 and Cosmas, V, 90–91 (Wolska, II, p. 137.)

[11] Corr. Noah was just and a descendant of the just or righteous Sethites and like them, did not mingle with the Cainites. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,1–3 and 56,1–3).

[12] Gen. 9,26.

[13] Corr.

[14] H: "the".

[15] Gen. 9,27. The subject of "abide" here is Japheth, see below st. 82,141,147 and esp. 199–200. Narsai differs in this respect from Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 51), Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 65,6–7), Cosmas, V, 87 (Wolska, II, p. 133), Diyarb., p. 64,27–65,1 and Išo'dad, p. 130,9–11 who understand God as the subject. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 82,n.15 for a discussion of the problem.

As for Shem, "Blessed is the Lord", and for Japheth, "May He amplify him" and for Ham "a servant":
three forms in one statement, separate yet equal.
75 One is the name of the Lord and one is abundance and one servitude
and these three are of one mouth in three words.
In three measures did the well-spoken one divide his sayings
and he harnassed them with the equal yoke of one word.
Three rods did the just father cause his sons to clasp
80 and one he lengthened and two he made shorter,[17] one more than the other.
Under the eldest he put the youngest and the middle (sons)
and upon his inheritance he made them dependent in two manners.
By way of words he hid the force which was within his words
and he placed the name of blessing on the first while not having blessed him.
85 There is no blessing for Shem the first should one inquire
for lo "Blessed is the Lord" did his father say and not "Blessed be Shem".
Nor was the curse with which he cursed the last relative to him
for lo, he cursed Canaan who was Ham's son and not Ham himself.
Shem's blessing did he address to the name of the Creator who is loftier than all
90 and for Ham, his iniquity did he address to Canaan his first-born.
Labored are your words, o righteous one, and obscure your history
and no man masters the meaning which is in your blessings.
Hidden is your meaning and very remote from those who inquire
and not easy is the inquiry into your words for him who inquires.
95 Your blessings do not adhere to the name of those blessed
nor do your curses afflict the souls of those cursed.
You sought to bless Shem who was named by the name of God[18]
but just as the blessing neared its destination you addressed it to its Lord.
You wanted, again, to curse hot Ham who was[19] hot in sin
100 and while you cause pain, you pained his son with the pain meant to be his.[20]
No man knows what to call you in accordance with your deed

---

16 Gen. 9,27.

17 Corr.

18 This is the etymology of Shem's name which is repeated in st. 187. For Ham, see st. 99. In Diyarb., p. 62,27, Theod. b. Koni, p. 184,18-19 and Išo'dad p. 130,22-23, Shem is said to mean "good name".

19 Corr.

20 Gen. 9,25-26. Narsai offers no explanation here. According to Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 50) Ham's having been blessed (Gen. 9,1) prevented him from being cursed. The curse was, however, transferred to his son who was as wicked as he. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 64,10-25) followed by Theod. b. Koni, p. 108,18-109,2, says that either Ham was blessed and thus could not be cursed or Canaan was indeed the first to see Noah's nakedness. Diyarb., p. 63,23-64,5 presents all three elements as does Išo'dad, p. 128,10-22.

neither one who blesses nor one who curses it would appear.
It seems to me that you are not in control of your will
and it is as if it were not you who speaks but another.
105 It seems that another compels your will to where he wants
and forcibly draws your reason to where he pleases.
Remember, o righteous one, that beyond you are the words which you spoke
and should you be required to reveal them, they would be too difficult for you.
They are too difficult for you; not that they are difficult but rather that they are hidden
110 and this is the wonder – that you recount something which is[21] hidden from you.
A great mystery is hidden in your word, o just man
and perhaps it is going to exalt the lowliness of your lowly race.
With the sweetness of life are your sayings filled, o mortal
and perhaps their sweetness will wipe away death from humanity.
115 A wonder is the speech which your heart welled up, dust of[22] Adam
and perhaps even the gathering of heavenly beings wonder at it.
No man blessed like your blessings even when blessing
for in the blessings you mixed curses and hid them.
God of the universe do you resemble, o man, in the license of your word
120 for to exchange good and evil is worthy of His Hint.
His Hint instructed you to resemble His resemblance
but what am I saying, that you resemble Him in the exchange of your words!
His is the word which uttered in the word of your mouth
and He emitted through you different voices of one meaning.
125 One meaning is hidden in the words of the just son of Lamech
and at one mark does the inquiry concerning his sayings aim.
The mark of truth did truth set up for the lover of truth
and he aimed at it as is seemly for the reverence of truth.
Revealed truth hinted to him that he reveal the truth of his name
130 so that men see His truthfulness in the mouth of a man.
In the mouth of Noah the word of truth which was tormented came to rest
and on his lips it murmured the voices of the reconciliation of man.[23]
Along with humanity it flowed from Adam, head of humanity
and its course did not rest until it reached the harbor of his body.
135 In his body and soul life force abided, reprover of man
and like a source he poured out its flow on the heads of his offspring.

---

21 Corr.

22 Corr.

23 This reconciliation came about through Noah's offer (Gen. 8,21). See above, Hom. II, st. 745-752 and Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,14).

Christ abided in him, what am I saying! - mysteriously[24]
and he gave Him to his sons in the form of the words in the blessings.
To his first-born he entrusted the repository of life which was hidden in him
for he saw that he knew how to preserve its treasures without harm.
His brothers he subjugated under the sovereignty of his primacy[25]
so that in their subjugation he make them share in the repository of life.
He distributed life from his (own) life force to the sons of his womb
and taught them to preserve the mystery of life which was in them.
Mysteriously he showed them the life which was in them
so that once revealed, they not contemn it as being unseemly.
For this purpose he harnassed Ham and Japheth to Shem the major
so that while unwilling they honor the mystery which was in the eldest.
The first-born he honored - not that he honored that which was of nature,
but rather to magnify Him who would renew nature which was worn out.
Not to nature did the one full of justice render honor
but rather to the mystery which fulfills all symbols in its perfection.[26]
Not indiscriminately did he render his words in three measures
but rather to make worthy the minds of his children with one word.
A word he said and while he surely said it, it was not he who said it
and he was very careful to say it in the order according to which he said it.
The Lord of the word is the (Divine) Being who is sovereign over all[27]
and its transmitter is Noah the righteous one and preserver of mysteries.
At his steadfastness did the Creator, to whom all is revealed, look
and He revealed and showed him the great mystery of the salvation of man.
The examination of his soul did He see, that he was steadfast in faith
and He placed in him the force to recount words of faith.
In faith he in turn received the word of his Lord
and he raised up his word and announced the truth which was disclosed to him.
In love he received the mystery of the disclosure disclosed to him
and he wondered much at the greatness of goodness towards man.
In a state of great wonder was the righteous one at the beginning of his word
at how a man was able to see men.

---

[24] So Cosmas, V, 88 (Wolska, II, p. 135), Diyarb., p 64,17-19, Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,14-16 and Išo'dad, p. 129,19-21.

[25] According to Narsai, not only Ham but Japheth too is subject to his brother, seeing that he dwells in Shem's tents. Cosmas also subjugates both brothers to Shem (V, 88; Wolska, II, p. 135).

[26] The words "mystery" and "symbols" are translations of the same Syriac word, i.e. *rāzā* (or *rāzē*). Similarly "fulfills" (or "perfects") and "perfection" are based on the same root, *gmr*.

[27] Corr.

Like the son of Jesse, the father of the son of Jesse wondered too
at the rank to which a man, lowly nature, ascended.
In a state of wonder which resembles that in the psalm "O Lord, our Lord"[28]
was Noah too at the time when the mystery was disclosed to him.
David wondered and composed words with the lyre of words
and Noah was amazed and produced a speech which causes life to flow.
At the life of his child he wondered and was amazed discerningly
at how exalted it was beyond the life force of fleshly beings.
At the Giver of life did the wise one wonder, not at life (itself)
and he diverted his word from the gift to the giver.
He opened his lips and sought to say "Blessed be my first-born son"
and he inverted his word and said "Blessed is the God of Shem".
In his promptitude he was going to bless his son
but wonder restrained him and he blessed the name replete with blessings.
"Blessed is the Lord", said the just one to the Just One who had created him
and he enclosed his son within the word towards his Lord.
In the blessing of his Lord the righteous one mixed the blessing of his son
for he believed that the name of God is entirely blessing.
"Blessed is the God of my son for He took pleasure in him and called him by His name[29]
and blessed too is my son for hidden within him is his Lord and His Son."
Him who was hidden in his son did he bewonder and he confessed and said,
"Blessed is the Lord who is going to reveal His Lordship in my son."
The future the Lord revealed to the good servant
not openly but in a mystery mysteriously.
From his offspring was going to come forth the redeemer of man.
about this did he wonder, about who was going to liberate whom.
From Shem was going to arise the king who would rule over all
and on account of this[30] he harnessed his brothers beforehand to the yoke of his name.
And if this is not so, why did he not give a single blessing
neither to Japheth whom he amplified nor to Ham whom he made a servant of servants?
Why did he not give Japheth an inheritance as to a just one
but rather granted him that he be amplified and become great in the inheritance of his brother?
Why, when he cursed Ham, did he not banish him to a faraway place

---

[28] Ps. 8.

[29] Lk. 3,22.

[30] Corr.

but rather enclosed him within the inheritance of the blessed brothers?[31]
Why did he not set him apart in a sentence like that of Cain[32]
and not allow him[33] to mingle with his relatives?[34]
Why did he not confirm the curse which was upon him according to what was said
and why did he not toil for his brother according to what was written?
Scripture teaches that the seed of Ham did not toil in servitude[35]
neither for the sons of Shem the first-born, nor for the sons of Japheth.
The sons of Ham, it is said, ruled first in primacy
and that it is true, Nimrod attests for he is the son of Ham.[36]
Nimrod received primacy and temporal kingship[37]
and before the Lord does scripture confirm his valor.[38]
"For he", Nimrod, "was a valiant hunter
as one would say, 'the Lord gave him primacy'."[39]
And if it is so that the Lord made Nimrod a valiant warrior,[40]
the curse, then, is not true according to how it was spoken.
The sons of Ham as well are the Egyptians and the Canaanites.[41]
and not that they were subjugated does scripture show, but rather that they subjugated![42]
The sons of Shem are the Israelites and the children of Abram
and unlawfully they toiled in servitude for the sons of the cursed one!
Where was it then that the word was fulfilled according to what was written?

---

[31] Gen. 9,25.27.

[32] Gen. 4,12.

[33] Corr.

[34] See above, Hom. II, st. 145-148 where the word "mingled" applies to the Sethites and Cainites.

[35] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 65,7-8) asserts that the seed of Ham did serve Shem at the time when the Canaanites were defeated by Joshua (Jos. 9,21-27). Cosmas, V, 86 (Wolska, II, p. 133) agrees with Narsai and claims that those who would apply the servitude to the Gibeonites are wrong. Diyarb., p. 64,12-15, Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,7-10 and Išoʿdad, p. 129,11-16, oppose Ephrem while Išoʿdad adds the Gibeonites to the Canaanites.

[36] Gen. 10,6.8.

[37] Gen. 10,10 lists Nimrod's kingdoms of which, according to Gen. 11,2, Shinar was the very first established. Išoʿdad, p. 129,16-17, says that not only the first kingdom but also the righteous priest Melchizedek came forth from Canaan.

[38] Gen. 10,9.

[39] Gen. 10,9(-10).

[40] This interpretation agrees with that of Diyarb., p. 66,22-67,1 followed by Išoʿdad, p. 132,21-22: "he (i.e. Nimrod) was victorious according to God's will". Diyarb., p. 67,18-20, also presents a negative view of Nimrod. For a survey of both the negative and positive views of Nimrod in early Jewish haggadah, cf. Van der Horst, "Nimrod".

[41] Gen. 10,6.

[42] So too Cosmas, V, 86 (Wolska, II, p. 133). In Hom. 72 "On Moses" (Mingana, II, p. 290), Narsai says that the Egyptians are rebuked for having subjugated the Israelites while the former in fact were meant to be slaves.

for lo the events were contrary to that which was said!
To what was said were they contrary, not in truth;
in meaning, true is the speech and its speaker.
Revealed truth abided in the history which the just one conveyed
and understanding is needed in order to show it to the mind's eye.
Without understanding the sight of its beauty cannot be seen
and without labor its truth cannot be experienced.
Labor does the history labored with hidden things require
and should a man labor, it is easy for him to see it clearly.
It is very clear to him who labors over it lovingly
and very dark for him who does not toil in the field of his love.
With love it is possible that all men see it as it is
and with comprehension it is even easy to relate it to others.
With love have I heard it and in occupation (with it) I desire to recount it
so that the lovers of love comprehend it and love it.
Beloved is the history which the just one conveyed concerning his beloved ones
and all men must consider it lovingly.
With man's benefit is the meaning which is hidden within it filled
the righteous one too wondered at this,[43] at just how beneficial it was.
According to its benefit the wise one looked and spoke of it in wisdom
so that its honorableness not be contemptible in the eyes of the foolish.
The eye of the foolish is accustomed to contemn that which is manifest
on account of this a veil of words was put over all words.
At the goal of the foolish was the Hint which spoke with Noah looking
and it covered the words of his mouth with a garment of words.
The Hidden One was able to (openly) reveal the mystery which He revealed to His servant
and it would have been easy for him to show him His love explicitly.[44]
Yet He did not show it (explicitly), not because it was wanting in benefit for man
but rather that men were not able to benefit from it.[45]
Not even to Noah himself, by means of whom He distributed the wealth of the mystery
did He show its sense exactly as it is.
The shadow of the truth did the bodily one see in the body of his son

---

[43] Corr.

[44] The Syriac words for "easy" and "explicitly" are both derived from the root *pšq*.

[45] Similarly in Hom. I, st. 95-104 the means of Enoch's translation were not manifest because men were not yet able to understand.

and he praised his Lord for having shown him the symbol before the reality.[46]
255 As a mirror He fixed the type before his mind
and he rushed and embraced it lovingly without satiety.
Without satiety was he recounting that expression
"Blessed is the Lord, the God of Shem, who blessed us by His name."
As in a portrait was he considering the rank of his son
260 and he called to his two brothers, "come and consider".
Blessing and curse was he hinting to the sons of his womb
so that they fix the look of their minds upon the mystery which he saw.
Japheth was he teaching to amplify his intellect and the faculties of his soul
so that he would suffice to grasp the wealth which flowed from Shem.
265 Ham he admonished to incline the shoulder of his impudence
and bear the yoke of service to the life which was hidden in his brother.
With blessing and curse was he inciting them to preserve his word
so that upon its being perfected in reality they acquire its wealth.
Before the reality was he desirous of doing that which was seemly
270 so that upon its being disclosed, it be seemly through the seemliness of his children.
At the seemliness of the beauty of the mystery which he saw had he been looking beforehand
and he incited his sons to depict it before their eyes.
With the mind's eye did the seer see the seemly mystery
and he was longing to see it in the body[47] without the veil.
275 Through the body of his son was the bodily one being consoled
and he believed that within him consolation[48] was hidden.
Like a mirror Shem was placed before his pupils
and the more he looked, the more he continued to look without satiety.
Upon Shem he fixed the gaze of his eyes and of his mind
280 and as one fellow to bodily love[49] was he occupied with his history.
Twice he repeated the history which was in the blessings[50]
and this he did out of love for his child.
A servant of servants he made Canaan twice[51]
and this is a sign of the tendering of love by a father to his sons.
285 With the love for his son the just one bound his sons
that they be harnessed to the Lordship of his Lord and His Son.

---

[46] Cf. Col. 2,17; Heb. 10,1.
[47] Or "substantially". Cf. Col. 2,17.
[48] This is perhaps a reference to the consolation which, according to Lamech, was to come to the world through Noah (Gen. 5,29). Diyarb., p. 53,10–13, states more explicitly that a hint is being made to Christ's coming.
[49] H: "and like one captured by bodily love".
[50] Gen. 9,26–27.
[51] Gen. 9,24.27.

To his Lord and His Son he subjugated the world through Ham and Japheth
since he knew that in their posterity the universe would be confined.
All in all was going to serve the child from him;
290 on account of this he harnessed his sons' neck with the yoke of his son.
The service of the king from his posterity he caused his sons to serve[52]
and he sealed them with the two seals of the exchange of words.
The seal of words did the son of Lamech put on Ham and on Japheth
and he exchanged them according to the number of decrees.
295 Wages of the blessing and curse he gave the two of them
and while they are quite distinct in name, in sense they are equal.
One is the sense of the two and one the meaning
in that one is he who was dividing two in one.
Two in one the just one divided from one to two:[53]
300 beneficence from Shem for licentious Ham and chaste Japheth.
Upon the servant he had pity as for the servant of the house of his Lord
and for the freeman as for one who is in need of support.
From the treasury of Shem the wealthy, Ham became wealthy and Japheth too
and they were subjugated to him lovingly and forcibly.
305 Japheth, out of love, received the seal of toiling for his brother
and Ham – by force his begetter compelled him to serve his brother.
In the name of freedom he gave freedom to the humble of spirit
and in servitude he harnessed the proud one to freedom.
Likewise did Paul do too in his writings
310 and he subdued slaves and freemen to the Lord Christ.
"Every slave is a freeman who is redeemed since youth
and the freeman too is a servant of the Lord Christ."[54]
And if Paul harnessed all[55] classes to one Lord
who would doubt Noah's word, that it is not so?
315 And that it is so, as is written, scripture attests
and the righteous of later times too avow it.

---

[52] One of two reasons for Noah's blessings according to Diyarb., p. 64,19–20, Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,16 and Išo'dad, p. 129,19–21 is to show in advance Christ's origins and that all would worship Him as Lord and king.
[53] H: "to the other".
[54] Gal. 3,28; Rom. 6,22. Another reason (in addition to that noted above, st. 291) for Noah's blessings offered only by Išo'dad, p. 129,28–29 and parallel to Narsai, is to show that God is the Lord of slaves and freemen. These words are actually taken from Narsai's Hom. 1, "On the Revelations Made to Abraham" (Mingana, I, p. 6) where God says that He is the one who "noted enslavement among men and placed it on Ham as a yoke.... and made them experience servitude in order to make known that I am the Lord of slaves and freemen... so that they learn the order of slaves and freemen".
[55] Corr.

After Noah, Abram received the promise of life[56]
and he sealed the book of the covenant in his two children.
Two he begot from his members full of blessings
320 and he gave them[57] to drink (from) the flow of words resembling that of Noah.
To Isaac he passed on the primacy which he had received from Shem
and the son of Hagar he harnessed with the yoke, that he serve like Ham.[58]
At Noah, who had blessed the one and subjugated the other, did the just one look
and he too consented to accomplish the words in deed.[59]
325 At this very mark did Isaac too, son of the promise, aim
and he imitated exactly the words in the deeds.
Like Noah and Abram did the begetter of words act towards his children
and in that very manner he recounted blessings full of wonder.
Jacob did he honor with the rights of the eldest while he was not the eldest[60]
330 and the eldest he reduced, placing him in the rank of the house of Ham.[61]
To Esau he said, "Should you repent you will be freed"[62]
but from what, then, did he free him for lo, he was free!
Esau was not subjugated to Jacob in all his life
nor did his seed serve in slavery for the Israelites.[63]
335 The words of the just which are in the scriptures are noted in wonder
and no man knows to wonder rightly at their meaning.
The force of understanding (re)enforced them to understand
how to depict the meaning of the words on the page of words.[64]
Like painters who paint images of future things
340 they depicted the likenesses of those which are not revealed by means of those[65] that are revealed.
Hail seers who see something about which they do not know

---

[56] According to Išo'dad, p. 129,10-11, the blessing went from Noah to Shem and then to Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.
[57] Corr.
[58] In the bible it is God and not Abraham who determines his children's destiny. Cf. Gen. 16,11-12; 17,20; 21,12-13 and 25,11.
[59] No blessing is given by Abraham to Isaac in the bible. Nevertheless, write both Theod. b. Koni, p. 135,16-17 and Išo'dad, p. 185,23, it is clear that Abraham blessed him.
[60] Gen. 27,27-29.
[61] Gen. 27,37.39-40.
[62] Pesh. Gen. 27,40.
[63] Išo'dad, p. 154,4-17, explains that the kingship began with Nimrod despite the fact that Canaan was to be a "slave of slaves" and so too Esau never served his brother. These and other blessings were fulfilled in Christ and if this is not so, then the contrary took place.
[64] Diyarb., p. 95,7-8, Theod. b. Koni, p. 135,18-21 and Išo'dad, p. 185,19-21, similarly say that it was God who gave the blessing through the mouth of Isaac.
[65] Corr.

for while unseen by them they recounted its likenesses before onlookers.
Hail heralds who disclosed symbols before the reality
and before He would come they revealed the mystery of his shining forth among earthly beings.
345 Hail guides who prepared the way for the coming of the King
and placed upon it milestones - words filled with the sign of peace.
Words of peace were the words of those filled with peace
and in the stations of their sayings did travelers rest.
A hostel of love did they build in the scriptures for the journey of men[66]
350 that they not suffer, through despair, a second destruction.[67]
To the one will of the one Creator did they consent equally
and they did not doubt about the expectation of hope which they had heard.
Good hope did they hear which He conveyed through their tongues
and they acquired hope to proclaim[68] hope of the future.
355 Noah first paved the way before their eyes
and they all followed the steps of the word of his mouth.
With his mouth did the swift of mind travel upon the way of hope
and with his tongue he went along the path of the promise of life.
Hail traveler whose mouth traveled instead of his strides
360 and while he did not travel, he spanned the earth with the tip of his tongue.
Hail guide who showed the way without strides
and placed milestones on it which can't be measured by steps.
Hail man who walked rightly in[69] the place of life
for your word arrived at the inn which gives life.
365 The Giver of life was hidden in your seed mysteriously
and He showed you beforehand the force of His life force through one of your offspring.
In your first-born did dwell the indwelling of immortal life
and your mind wondered when considering the life of your son.
In a state of great wonder were your thoughts at the fruit which is of you
370 for you saw borne[70] in the offshoots of his body the life of man.
With intelligence you looked at that life force which revives the universe
and it[71] called your sons to look at it expediently.
With joy did your word look at the mystery in Shem
and towards its location it focused the wandering of his brothers' gaze.

---

[66] For milestones, stations and hostels, see below st. 362 and 364 and Hom. I, st. 283 above.
[67] Diyarb., p. 62,9-14 followed by Išo'dad, p. 126,22-24 claims that the rainbow was given in order to prevent mankind from losing hope of life (*nepsqun sabrā d-ḥayyayhon*).
[68] "Proclaim" in Syriac consists of the same consonants as "hope" (*sbr*).
[69] H: "toward".
[70] Corr.
[71] "You" may perhaps be preferable here.

At the seemliness of its beauty did you cause the sons of your womb to wonder
and while unwilling they depicted its likenesses before their eyes.
Like an image were they considering the word of your mouth
while it was depicting the image of their lives with the name of God.
Like a reed pen did your mind clasp the name of your God
and it noted with it that expression "Blessed is the Lord".
Blessed is the Lord for the Lord formed you into a master painter
that you depict in your sons the image of praise which they owe Him.
With the debt of love for your Lord you harnassed your offspring
so that they tender beneficence to the Beneficent One who fashioned them.
Good leaven[72] did the Good One bury in you in His goodness
and you put it in the body of your sons that it preserve them.
Wisely did you act, wise one, towards your offspring
for you secreted the wealth of their needs in their members.
The Instructor of man instructed your faculties to do this
so that with your posterity the life of your race will flow.
The Lover of your race placed in your race the repository of life
and He secreted it[73] in your land[74] that it be preserved until the end of time.
Like merchants did the senses of its transmitters bear it
and they transmitted it in love from one to the other until Mary.[75]
Hail marvel from the Creator to (a) man
for while he was mortal he became the guardian of his own life force.
Hail thoughts of the Fashioner of the universe, how deep they are[76]
for He placed in His creation the wealth which ministers to its needs.
Hail Craftsman who, from nothing, made everything
for He provided and filled His craftwork with His wise designs.
The wisdom of truth which is of His wise designs did He place in our nature
and it is this which instructed the immaturity of our race to know His name.
It revealed to Adam about the hiddenness which formed him[77] manifestly[78]
and it is this which informed him that he has as Lord the Lord of the universe.[79]

---

[72] Cf. 1 Cor. 5,6; Gal. 5,9.

[73] Corr.

[74] Read (?) "your seed" (*zar'ăk*) instead of "your land" (*'ar'ăk*).

[75] For Narsai's list of the transmitters of the repository of life, cf. Hom. 5, "On the Blessed Mary" (ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 26v-28r). Narsai is far more selective than is Aphrahat in Demonstration 23. Cf. Parisot, *Aphraatis*, II, 1-93.

[76] Ps. 92,6.

[77] Corr.

[78] Gen. 2,23. Cf. Gignoux, I, 177-182; IV, 17-22.

[79] Narsai explains in Hom. 2, "On Revelations" (Mingana, I, p. 29) that God revealed Eve's creation to Adam whereby he understood that he too had been created by God.

It bound Abel, the pure one, within the love of his Lord
and through manifest things he tendered praise seemly to the Hidden One.[80]
Through it Enoch the pleasing was instructed to make himself pleasing
and because he was greatly pleasing he remained in the pleasingness of immortals.[81]
It disclosed to Lamech about the child who came forth from him
that he would relieve the earth and remove the mourning of man's sadness.[82]
It uttered through the son of Lamech a new utterance as well
and his mouth conveyed new voices of the renewal of man.[83]
Everything which that knowledge said was of God
and it instructed all and will (continue to) instruct all until the end.
From His wise designs the first (generations) learned to be wise
and it, moreover, perfects others too who came afterward.
Noah, beyond all, was instructed by it in disclosing its mysteries
and moreover, it called him from among all,[84] bringing him near to its household.
As to a beloved it revealed to him the mystery of its secrets
and he too in love preserved the command of its steadfastness.
Steadfastly the lover of truth preserved reverence of truth
and it too in truth tendered him wages beyond his labor.
A goodly wage did it tender to the just one who toiled along with it
and he benefited from it and gave it to his sons that they be secreted in it.
The ministry of immortal life it placed in his hands
and he placed it, in turn, in the hands of his sons that they live from its food.
The food of life the just one ate and fed to his sons
and its life-potion flourished in our nature and preserved it in life.
Life, from Noah, flowed with our race from Noah onwards
and it will (continue to) flow until the course of time ends.
From us life has begun to flow anew
and with us it remains in nearness without end.
The Force which created us created life in us and secreted it
and when it pleased Him He showed it before all and in all.
In our very formation he buried the life force which is from His life force

---

[80] Gen. 4,3-4 and Gignoux, IV, 320 and 327f.

[81] Gen. 5,24; Heb. 11,5-6. See above, Hom. I.

[82] Gen. 5,29. Here the common East-Syrian etymology of the name Noah as "repose" or "one who brings repose" or "relief" seems to be combined with the comfort Noah will bring according to Pesh. Gen. 5,29.

[83] Diyarb., p. 53,10-13 adds that Lamech alludes through Noah, who will bring consolation and hope, to Christ who will bring resurrection and renewal.

[84] H: "and it beyond all called him, bringing...".

and after a while He revealed His will which was hidden in us.
Hiddenly and manifestly He showed His love towards our humanity
and wisely He accomplished His will through us towards all.
Through us He fulfilled His activity towards all and in all.[85]
Come, let us praise Him more than all for He has loved us more than all.

---

[85] Corr.

Homily IV

On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues

Homily IV

On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues[1]

A sign of peace[2] did the Creator give to man's nature
that they not be terrified by the deluge which destroyed man.[3]
A covenant of love did He convene with the fleshly beings,
that He would no more be angry and chastise their deeds with water.[4]
Through a manifest sign He showed them the greatness of His love –
how much He loves the members of His household and hates iniquity.
The sign of the rainbow He stretched in the clouds before their eyes
that they look at it and hate iniquity which destroyed them.
In the rainbow He revealed to them His harshness and His gentleness
that it is He who chastises and He who retains in wisdom.[5]
An arched bow did He show them which was without string
to teach them that He won't shoot arrows of water at them.[6]
Without a hand and without a string He showed the bow
to inform them that He is not desirous of shooting at mankind.
Not for a bow shot did He stretch it in the air and magnify its aspect
but rather to raise dread and love in the mind of man.[7]
Dread and love did He fix in the clouds like a mirror
that they look at it[8] and hate iniquity and choose love.
The appearance of blood and the splendor of fire were depicted in it[9]
which disclosed how much He threatens iniquitors.
Peace and lashes and the force of His Essence were hidden in its aspect

---

[1] AHI: "By the Same (Author). Homily Fifty Two. On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues".

[2] The rainbow is called a sign of peace both by Išoʿ b. Nun, Q. XVII, fol. 10r,16–11r,6 and Išoʿdad, p. 125,11.

[3] Had God not given the rainbow, according to Diyarb., p. 62,14, Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,2–3 and Išoʿdad, p. 126,25–26, men would have been frightened every time rain fell and would lose hope.

[4] Gen. 9,11–15.

[5] Dt. 32,6. The same expression occurs in Gignoux, VI, 102 and similar is Hom. II, st. 623–624 above.

[6] Diyarb., p. 62,14–16, Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,3–5 and Išoʿdad, p. 126,26–27 consider the fashioning of the bow without a string (Išoʿdad adds without a string and without arrows) the means by which God made His gentleness known.

[7] Narsai ascribes the same motivation for the expulsion from Paradise. Cosmas frequently repeats the notion that neither death nor the arrest of death were imposed on man in wrath but rather to make him hate sin and love justice. This was true in the case of Adam (V, 69–70; Wolska, II, p. 107–109), Abel (V, 76–77; Wolska, II, p. 117–119), Enoch (V, 83; Wolska, II, p. 127) and Noah (V, 89; Wolska, II, p. 135–137).

[8] Corr.

[9] Acts 2,19.

for like the bow, so its holder and the arrows of His anger.
As with a finger He showed them in a stern sign[10]
"This is what I held in my lofty arm on the day of the flood.
25 With it I stretched the Hint of my will in the likeness of a string
and shot and aimed at refractory iniquity which is in you.
This did I clasp in the hand of my will valiantly
and shot swift arrows of water at the ranks of man.
With this I cut down the thorn-filled field of the evil ones[11]
30 and the waves became my reapers and fulfilled my will.
I am He who cut down along with humanity animals as well
and yet I made them a bridge of corruptible clay.[12]
I am He who also reserved a remnant[13] with Noah my beloved[14]
and kept alive with Noah the dumb species to work for man.[15]
35 I am He who preserved in dead wood life of all things
and they did not sink in the tempests and terrible waves.
My will stood as a sailor in the midst of the ark
and as with oars it navigated it[16] into the harbor of peace.
To peace my hidden will conducted it[17] as with ropes
40 and brought it out and placed it in the middle of the earth without harm.[18]
Lo, I have brought you into the harbor of peace as I promised;
regard and spurn not my commandments as the earlier generations.
Lo, I showed you the harshness of the lashes which the evil ones endured;
cease from iniquity that you not be lashed like the iniquitors.
45 Lo, I have taught you the ways of justice and the name of grace;
regard and conduct yourselves wisely by both.
Lo, I have convened a covenant of peace between me and you;
do not dissolve it by neglectful iniquity, lest I revert to anger.
Lo, regard the bow which is stretched out by me on high
50 yet there is neither string nor even a hand which conducts it.
Look and consider that for the day of battle the bow is suited

---

[10] The stern sign (*'ātā qšitā*) is a play on bow (*qeštā*).

[11] Since Adam's transgression, the earth was cursed and brought forth thorns (Gen. 3,18). Further sin and sinners are designated by Narsai, as in Mt. 7,16; 13,7 and esp. Heb. 6,8, in terms of thorns and the uprooting or burning thereof. See, for example, McLeod, II, 139–140.

[12] See above, Hom. II, st. 571.

[13] Corr.

[14] So too Hom. II, st. 597–598 and III, st. 65 above.

[15] Theodore (Jansma, p. 75, fol. 21v,13–17), Cosmas, II, 41 (Wolska, I, p. 349) and Išoʻdad, p. 118,16–17 agree with Narsai when viewing the preservation of the animals for man's service as part of the improved situation after the flood.

[16] Corr.

[17] Corr.

[18] For the notion of the land upon which Noah disembarked being on the other side of the ocean from Eden, see Cosmas, II, 42–43 (Wolska, I, p. 349–350).

yet I, lo, I have made it a sign of peace between me and man.
It is peace that I desire and not war against humanity
and because of this I did not place a string on the bow which I showed.[19]
55 Lo, I have shown you the desire of my will – that it is a lover of man;
do not force me against my will to act in anger.[20]
May heaven and earth be witnesses between me and you[21]
that it does not please me to kill a man without offense."
These voices the Hidden One proclaimed hiddenly to man
60 and He wrote them in the testament of the sign of the bow.
Noah and his sons examined them as (one would) a document
but after a time his offspring strayed after error.
For a time peace endured among earthly beings
but after a short while contention entered and ruled on earth.
65 The remnant which remained after the waters turned to its own corruption
and began to walk on the way of aberration like the earlier generations.
They abandoned the inheritance of the commandment[22] of peace which they had received from Noah
and they forgot the sign which the Creator had placed between Him and them.
They went forth from the place and vicinity of the ark
70 and began roaming about in order to choose places.[23]
They departed from Qardu where they had come out into the harbor of peace
and they made straight the way to go to Babel, name of confusion.[24]
They departed from the peace of the name of the Creator whose love is rich
and they went forth seeking the inheritance of the earth whose womb is poor.
75 In desire for earth the earthly beings went forth from peace[25]
to establish themselves in places which were good and lovely.
They were all united when going towards Babel
and one was the people and one the tongue and one the thought.[26]

---

[19] According to Išoʻdad, p. 125,18–20, kings send unstrung bows to their enemies in order to make peace and as a sign that war was over.

[20] See above, Hom. II, st. 71–74.

[21] Dt. 30,19.

[22] Corr.

[23] Gen. 11,2, "they journeyed from the east" is understood by Narsai as from the place where they had landed or dwelled after the flood, see below, st. 99. So too Cosmas, III, 2 (Wolska, I, p. 439): "they multiplied in the east where the ark had landed and moved outward". Diyarb., p. 67,23–25, applies the verse to the voyage from Eden. Išoʻdad, p. 136,12–18 records the two contrary opinions.

[24] Gen. 11,2.9. Babel (Gen. 11,9) is identified with Shinar of Gen. 11,2 and with Gen. 10,10 where the capital of Nimrod's kingdom is in Babel of Shinar. So too Diyarb., p. 67,16–21.27 and Išoʻdad, p. 136,15–16 and 145,23.

[25] See above, Hom. II, st. 81 and 138 for a similar expression.

One will led them as far as Babel
80 but within Babel they became desirous[27] with the desire of labor and iniquity.[28]
A hateful desire did the impudent ones desire impudently
in the likeness of Adam who desired and coveted fruit and rank.
Foolish pride incited the sons of Adam
and that very error they too erred like their father.
85 That very thought which came to Adam – that he become God[29] –
came to his sons, that they snatch[30] divine rank.
On the way of Adam did his sons too walk impudently[31]
and a stronghold of iniquity did they seek to erect against the Creator.[32]
Against the Maker did those of ash and sons of dust revolt[33]
90 and they readied arms to struggle for their lives.
Arms of iniquity did the iniquitous don iniquitously
and they proceded to shoot arrows of pride at truth.[34]
Foolish pride did the foolish ones don in the likeness of arms
and like a helmet they set pomp upon the head of their intellect.[35]
95 Height and deep did they think they could gain under their control
and then ascend and be[36] in the high rank of divinity.
Ignorantly did the ignorant ones think that which they thought
and they did not look properly into the consequences of their deeds.
Without understanding they departed from the place whence they had been cast[37]
100 and inordinately they sought to commence with the building of iniquity.
Just what was that desire which burned in their thoughts
and why did they purpose to undertake immeasurable labor?

---

26 Gen. 11,1.

[27] H: "they conceived the desire".

[28] Gen. 11,3–4.

[29] Gen. 3,5–6f.

[30] The verb snatch (*ḥṭp*) also has the sense "to pluck" which is reminiscent of the plucking of the fruit in Paradise and is used by Narsai for the fruit and divinity in Gignoux, I, 275–278 and IV, 154.

[31] Impudence is thought by both Diyarb., p. 67,22 and Īšoʻdad, p. 138,4 to be the cause of the building of the tower.

[32] Gen. 11,4.

[33] The Syriac words for "stronghold" and "revolt" make use of the same consonants, i.e. *mrd*. Ephrem speaks twice of the "rebellious city" (Tonneau, p. 66,1 and 26). For "those of ash and sons of dust" cf. Gen. 2,7, Gignoux, I, 163–164, Diyarb., p. 24,20 and Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 33,n.202.

[34] The word for truth, *quštā*, calls to mind the bow, *qeštā*, with which they would shoot the arrows.

[35] Cf. Eph. 6,11.17 where salvation and not pomp serves as a helmet.

[36] H: "stand".

[37] HI: "the place in which they had been dwelling".

Just why did they raise their minds on high[38]
and because of what did they set out on the way which is too difficult for mortals?[39]
105 Evil desire tormented those stubborn of heart
and iniquitously they sought to raise their wings on high.[40]
The inclination in them woke them as if from sleep
and their thoughts began to meditate upon unseemly things.
As if in sleep their senses sunk away from what was proper
110 and like industrious ones they arose and were diligent in the earthly work.
They abandoned divine work which procures life
and undertook labor of no benefit to body or soul.
They scorned the oath of God of the universe[41] which is indissoluble
and they forswore the sign full of peace which He had shown them.
115 They thought, "He will forswear and will not keep His word as He promised
and will again bring the frightful waters and destroy us."[42]
Untrue did the foolish think Him who is truer than all
and because of that they began to build a stronghold against the Creator.
For this purpose those proud of heart joined up
120 and they undertook labor which would not reach completion.
This thought did the foolish conceive without understanding –
to build a house in order that they be saved by it from the flood.
With this idea were they armed as with arms –
to organize a battle against the Maker on high.
125 Three things did those bereft of intellect plot which were surely futile
and because of them they prepared arms that they might gain victory with them.[43]
One – that they would be saved from the deluge should it come to be
and another – that they engage in a contest on high with the Creator.
And the third, then – that once they had struggled and were victorious and come to rule[44]

---

[38] Haughtiness led to the building of the tower according to Diyarb., p. 68,17–18 and Īšoʻdad, p. 137,14.24–25. It was also "on high" that the people sought to make a nest, cf. Īšoʻdad, *ibid.*,28–29 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 111,6.

[39] Īšoʻdad, p. 137,21–23 writes that they persevered but the work wouldn't be finished.

[40] Enoch, Noah and Jesus, as opposed to this group, flew rightfully on high. The imagery of birds is employed by Īšoʻdad and Theod. b. Koni as well. See above, st. 103.

[41] Is. 54,9.

[42] Fear as the (unfounded) motive for the building of the tower in order to escape a flood and to war against God is found in Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,3–4), Cosmas, III, 2 (Wolska, I, p. 439), Cyrus, p. 181,18–21, Theod. b. Koni, p. 111,11–15 and Īšoʻdad, p. 137,29–138,3.6–7.

[43] H: "over him".

[44] Corr.

130 they would leave behind on earth a vainglorious name[45] as victors.[46]
For victory were the sons of the guilty one struggling
not knowing that they would surely be vanquished as was their forefather.
They desired and plotted to gain victory with the arms of pride
and they brought out in the open the hidden deceit of their minds.[47]
135 "Come let us mould bricks of clay and bake them
and build a tower whose top reaches the height above.[48]
Come let us struggle with the labor and[49] the deliverance of our lives [...][50]
Come let us make ourselves a name among creation beyond that of all men
so that generations to come will recount the victory of our force.[51]
140 Come let us act mightily in the struggle against the Maker
and make a frightful battle against Him on high.
Come let us arm ourselves with arms fit for warriors
and let us shoot arrows at God of the universe who destroyed our race.
Come let us wreak the vengeance of the blood of our companions
145 for He wiped them out with the sword of water without mercy.[52]
Come let us do to Him as He acted towards those of our people
and exact from Him the blood of our nature which He shed gratuitously.
Come let us say to him, once we are victorious, as in judgment,
'Why did you destroy dumb natures along with humanity?'
150 With judgment and arms let us wage war with him valiantly
and take over His rank and the name of His sovereignty and it will be ours.[53]
Let us mould bricks and bake them in a flame[54]
that they not become damp once water is poured upon them.[55]
Let us build a fortress and let us store up, filling it with arms and host

---

[45] The words "vainglorious name" are used by Ephrem as well (Tonneau, p. 66,7).

[46] Išoʻdad, p. 137,29–138,9, lists four reasons for the building of the tower of which the third and fourth are parallel to the three provided by Narsai in st. 125–130. Stichs 129–130, commencing with "once", are reproduced literally (p. 138,7–9).

[47] According to Theod. b. Koni, p. 111,22–24, who is followed by Išoʻdad, p. 139,4–7, God allowed their thoughts to come out into the open so that when the tongues would be confounded, they not reprove Him.

[48] Gen. 11,4.

[49] H: "labor of".

[50] One stich is missing.

[51] "A name" (Gen. 11,4) is interpreted as "a remembrance" in Diyarb., p. 68,12–13. Išoʻdad, p. 137,9.25–26, combines this with Narsai so that "a name" means a remembrance of the victory for generations to come. For Cosmas, III, 2 (Wolska, I, p. 439) it is making a name by battling against God while united, prior to being dispersed.

[52] Išoʻdad, p. 138,5–6 also includes revenge as a motivating factor.

[53] Comp. st. 219. Another possible translation is "and we will be independent". Comp. Diyarb., p. 55,24–25.

[54] Gen. 11,3.

[55] Similarly Cosmas, III, 2 (Wolska, I, p. 439): "let us make bricks and bake them in a fire that they resist water".

155 so that it suffice on the day of struggle which is being prepared for us.
Let us amplify its walls and make them great according to His greatness
so that the waves of water and the storms of the winds not shake it.
Let us make it firm and build it artfully as befits us
so that after a time our art not lie concealed.
160 With fired earthen blocks let us build it entirely as with stones
and instead of clay let us use cement between its fissures.
Cement and earthen blocks let us mix together for the building of our labor[56]
so that the changes of the seasons, cold and warm, not harm it.
And along with our building, let us fortify our minds as well
165 and let us not become weak before Him who is coming to wage war with us.
See that the one not abandon the other at the time of battle
lest He scatter us throughout the entire earth, He who opposes us."[57]
Woe to the proud ones, for while not willing they discerned and prophesied
and disclosed beforehand their later dispersion.[58]
170 Woe to the blind ones, for while not seeing they saw precisely
and looked into and understood that which would be as if it[59] had already taken place.
Woe to those who were united in one[60] thought in the building of iniquity
for they subscribed to the disunity of their tongues.
They themselves made a proclamation – not of themselves – concerning their defeat
175 and revealed and showed their dispersion in all directions.
They subscribed and wrote and agreed: they would not be dispersed
and did not consider the sentence which their mouth issued.
They wrote their indictment with the loose pen of their tongues
and did not desist from or relinquish the foolish thought which they had conceived.
180 They excavated and dug and placed foundations as for eternity
and did not know that near was the time when they would be overthrown.
They fired the tiles and baked the cement and began building
and along with their building their thoughts arose.
The more the building rose up on high
185 the more their heart surged with pride.

---

[56] The term "cement" occurs in both Diyarb., p. 68,10–11 and Išoʻdad, p. 136,27 and 137,2 while "earthen blocks" is in neither.

[57] Gen. 11,4.

[58] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,11–12) followed by Išoʻdad, p. 137,15–16, explains that the opposite of what they had planned would take place (i.e. all their fears would be realized).

[59] Corr.

[60] H: "united by".

The more it increased in measure from day to day
so the iniquity in them did grow beyond measure.
Their heart was vigilant and did not sleep night or day[61]
and while they were tired, they did not sense how tired they were.
190 They were very eager for the time when their desire would prevail
and were awaiting the time when they would see the completion of the labor.[62]
The desire in them was not sated in building
and their senses and faculties did not relinquish work.
The Maker – He by whom things are seen before they come into being – saw
195 that in vain were they tiring themselves building[63] and sinning exceedingly.
He saw that if they would build, they would not be able to build as they had planned[64]
and He restrained them so that they would not be shattered by labor and iniquity.
He was merciful and had compassion in the way that He is accustomed to be compassionate[65]
and He began to convey voices of love and threat.
200 Love did He mix in the sentence against the impudent ones
and in mercy He cut out the pain of their minds.[66]
It was mercy He had on that labor which was without understanding
and in the guise of wrath He relieved them from the deluge.
With the guise of anger was that voice which He caused them to hear filled
205 and within it was hidden unspeakable love.
A manifest voice did He who possesses no voice cause them to hear suddenly[67] –
that He and those with Him were readying to descend.[68]

---

[61] When God says that nothing they have thought up will not be completed (Gen. 11,6), He means, say Diyarb. p. 68,16–17 and Išoʿdad, p. 137,12–14, that they will not rest until they accomplish their purpose.

[62] See st. 188 above.

[63] Cf. Diyarb., p. 68,21 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,11–12 (*ʿamlā sriqā*).

[64] Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 51) explains that even if they'd been allowed to build, they wouldn't have been able to pass the mountains or stand the heat of the sun. Similarly Cosmas, III, 2 (Wolska, I, p. 441) who says they'd perish by the violence of the winds, the heat of the sun and vertigo.

[65] Cosmas, III, 3 (Wolska, I, p. 439–441), Diyarb., p. 68,20–21, Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,10–12, and Išoʿdad, p. 138,24–25 consider God merciful in stopping the people from wearying themselves to death.

[66] Išoʿdad, p. 138,17–18, says that God's healing of the wounds of our race is the purpose of "let us descend and see" (Gen. 11,5.7 but in fact closer to Gen. 18,21), i.e., let us see their wounds and provide healing.

[67] Cf. Acts 2,2. According to Išoʿdad, p. 138,19–21, a sensible voice was heard by all. Cyrus, p. 184,11–22, says concerning the sudden voice of Acts 2,2 that it attests to the subtlety of God's nature which enacts all things.

His counsellors was the Omniscient One consulting
and as if for help He called upon them to descend with Him.
210 "Lo, men are one people and one tongue
and have now gathered together to struggle against my will.[69]
Lo, the sons of Adam have sallied forth against my Lordship like their forefather
and are seeking to ascend to the high rank of divinity.
Lo, mortals fear the death of destruction by water
215 and have (now) built a fortress in order to take refuge in it from the deluge.
Lo, earthly beings have prepared arms and have taken secret council
in order to ascend and raise contention on high between me and them.
Lo, they have set conditions that they not be divided one against the other
until they are victorious and height and deep become theirs.
220 Lo, they prophesied while not willing concerning their (own) dispersal
and it is right that the word which they spoke be fulfilled in deed.[70]
Come, let us descend and divide them one from the other
so that they no longer heed the speech and utterance of their tongues.[71]
Come, let us raise contention among them stealthily while they are unsensing
225 and steal from them the sword of the word in which they take pride.
Come, let us descend together to earth without migration
and let us battle without hands against fleshly beings.
Come, let us give them the diverse utterance of all tongues
and lo, they will be divided and the battle of their thoughts void.
230 Come, let us cry out among them a new voice with which they are not familiar
and cast some of them into the exile of the many places."
O Creator, what is this which You proclaim?
for new are the voices which Your Hint causes to be heard concerning Your Essence.
To whom do You call to descend with You towards earthly beings
235 and whom do You ask to be a help to Your might?[72]
Whom do You consult to be a speaker along with You to man
and to whom do You say, "Come with me, let us descend and divide them"?
Who was it who gave You advice in the beginning when You created[73]

---

[68] Gen. 11,7.

[69] Gen. 11,6.

[70] This is the interpretation of Gen. 11,6 offered by Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,10–12) and repeated by Išoʿdad, p. 137,15–16.

[71] Gen. 11,7.

[72] God said "come" and not "go", according to Išoʿdad, p. 138,11–13, because the former is suitable for the helpers (i.e. the Son and the Spirit) who are with Him while the latter is appropriate for messengers.

and to whom did You disclose the hidden mysteries of Your divinity?
240 Who helped You when You created heaven and earth
and who reenforced You to give force to the work of Your hands?
Whom did You ever call or approach for speech along with You
and whom did You deem worthy to carry out the sentence according to Your findings?
Your voice likens that earlier one of the sixth day
245 when You formed Adam's image with the finger of Your Hint.[74]
There alone did You make heard a voice which likens this one:
that of "Come, let us make man in our image according to[75] our likeness."[76]
One is the voice and one is the meaning of that and this
there - "Come, let us make" and here - "Let us descend" are similar and affirmed.
250 One is the Hint which proclaimed them, that and this
and one is the Nature which fashioned there and divided here.
To His counsellors He called with "Let us descend" and "Let us make"
and it is they who made man and divided man.
It is the Father who called to the Son and the Spirit at the fashioning of Adam
255 and them did He invite for the division of that which they had created.
At the fashioning of man and the division of man the Creator wished
to reveal the mystery of the disclosure of the hypostases which were hidden with Him.[77]
It is evident then, that there is none among the works greater than man
for lo, hidden things which are hidden from all are revealed in him.[78]
260 And if this is not so, let us inquire as to the cause of that "Come" which is said[79]
which at his fashioning and his division alone is noted.
If not to the Son and Spirit who are of Him He called in the two (instances)
who is it then who is equal to Him that He consult him?
To the heavenly beings inappropriate is that expression -

---

73 Cf. Gen. 1,26.

[74] Gen. 1,26.

[75] H: "even in".

[76] Gen. 1,26. So too Gignoux, I, 118 and 125; III, 265. Cf. Cosmas, V, 239 (Wolska, II, p. 349), Cyrus, p. 148,1-2, Theod. b. Koni, p. 114, 7-8, Diyarb., p. 68,2-3 and Išo'dad, p. 138,13-14. Cosmas, Cyrus and Išo'dad cite Gen. 1,26 without "come". For the addition of "come" (absent in Pesh.) to Gen. 1,26, see Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 88,n.8.

[77] The following relate Gen. 1 and Gen. 11 to a disclosure of the Trinity: Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,13-15), Cosmas, V, 240 (Wolska, II, p. 351), Diyarb., p. 68,21-23, Theod. b. Koni, p. 114,5-7 and Išo'dad, p. 138,10-11.

[78] Išo'dad, p. 138,11-13 states that along with the hypostases, God makes known the greatness of His love for His image.

[79] H: "which He said".

265 "Come with me, let us make" and "Come with me, let us descend" - as (if to) His partners.
Had He said, "Go, descend, divide the tongue of man"
it would perhaps be likely that He called and sent spiritual ones.[80]
Indisputably, therefore, was that (expression) "Come, let us descend"
being said to the Son and the Spirit, hypostases who are with Him.
270 To the Son and the Spirit fashioning as well as division are appropriate
and with Him, the Father, they created all things and divided men.
They fashioned and they divided wisely -
Father and Son and Holy Spirit, an equal Nature.
They are the ones who descended now without migration
275 in order to take away speech and give (foreign) speech to the nature of man.
In the division of man they noted the mystery of their hypostases
and they explained it at the end in the gift of tongues.[81]
They called one another for the fashioning and to the division
so that all men would learn that one is the nature of the three of them.
280 They descended in order to divide - not descent in migration[82]
but rather in the Hint whose swiftness is unspeakable.
The Hint did He send like an envoy to the impudent ones
and it called out suddenly and terrified those full of pride.
It is the Hint which descended and removed from them the arms of speech
285 and girded them with other arms of another speech.
With a harsh sword It severed the speech of their tongues
and placed in them speech which differed from the first.
He removed the first to teach them that He fashioned all
and He gave yet a second to inform them that He is sovereign over all.[83]
290 Wisely did He war with them according to their desire
but instead of the body, against the mind[84] He struggled.
Artfully He engaged in contest with their faculties

---

[80] So Išo'dad, see above, st. 235. Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 52) says that God addresses Himself in the majestic plural.

[81] Acts 2. Cosmas, V, 240 (Wolska, II, p. 351) says that God first alluded to the Trinity and spoke of it more clearly later. Cf. Cyrus, p. 147,29-148,3.

[82] God, according to Narsai, being omnipresent, can not descend from one place to the other. See, e.g., Mingana, I, p. 321-2; 353; II, p. 11; 132; 172 and McLeod, I, 1-10.91-96.409-418 and V, 183-186. This idea is prominent in Theodore; see, e.g., Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p. 102-106, fol. 26v,23-27v,7, p. 182, fol. 46v,10-22 and Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 34. Theod. b. Koni, p. 114,4-5 and Išo'dad, p. 138,22-23, note that this is the first instance in scripture where God is said to descend.

[83] One of the reasons for the division of tongues proffered by Išo'dad, p. 138,26-28, is that men be instructed and develop in wisdom and know the greatness of the force of the Creator.

[84] Corr.

and tied them with the harsh ropes of their tongues.
A marvel was the war which the Hidden One waged against the earthly ones
and the mind is unable to relate its wonder, no matter how much it relates.
Just what was that blade which He grasped in His hand
and destroyed speech instead of members while the body was not pained?
Just how did the hidden Hint enter their thoughts
and pillage, taking the treasure in them, while they did not sense it?
How did He snatch the force–possessing word of their mouth
and make them stutterers and stammerers one to another?
How did the Source of the life force dry up the first speech
so that words no longer flowed in the stream of the mouth as they were accustomed?
How did He sever that flow of the one tongue
and pave the way for the mind to flow in new voices?
How and in what way can we say that that which happened, happened –
that He severed the word and made word spring forth in a change of voice?
To that very Hint which enacted this should we attribute its meaning
for He knows how He did it swiftly.
To Him is manifest how He pillaged man's word
and how He gave yet (an)other wealth which was distinct from that one.
To Him belongs the wealth of speech, the latter[85] and the former
and He severed the word and grafted word in nature.
The finger of His Hint struck suddenly the lyre of the soul
and it began to sing new voices which were foreign to it.
That very Commandment which breathed into it in the beginning and it aquired voice[86]
uttered to it in another speech and it heeded His voice.
Not its nature did He change and make another nature
rather, speech acquired change in its very nature.
The word which was of it did the Commandment color with another pigment
and it acquired the hue and changed voice and it wondered at this.
That Voice which said "Let us descend" descended, He and those with Him
and He terrified the ranks of men who were frightened.
He descended while not descending for there is no place where He can walk;[87]
His Commandment descended and fulfilled His word and He remained as He is.
He descended while He is near to everything and in everything without limit

---

[85] Corr.
[86] Gen. 2,7.
[87] Cf. Gen. 3,8.

that in His descent He lower man from haughtiness.
He descended and shook the pride of their thoughts
and He removed from them the arms of pride which they had donned.
A great marvel fell suddenly upon the impudent ones
and they were astonished and sat in amazement at that which had occurred.
They looked at each other while astonished one before the other –
was that them or was it perhaps another appearance?
They uttered one to another a voice which was foreign to the word in them
and the ear was not able to hear the meaning of the voice.
For they heard the hearing of the ear[88] without comprehension
and they saw, moreover, the movement of the mouth without understanding.
In a state of doubt were the miserable ones about that which had happened
and they were considering the nature of the body – that perhaps it was not itself.
The appearance of the body was true to the eyes of the body
yet the voice of the word was very foreign to the hearing of the ear.[89]
Marvelling were eyes and ears, the one at its fellow
for the one was seeing and the other blind in understanding.
The mouth was silently amazed by its companions
about how they were uttering differing utterances yet it was unknowing.
Wonder and marvel fell upon faculties and members
and amazed was the soul by the body and the body by the soul.
The soul was marvelling at the body, which heard yet remained still
and the body was amazed by the soul, at the foreignness of its utterance.
The soul marvelled even more about itself
about just who it was who had changed the sound of the melodies of its (faculty of) speech.
"Am I soul, or am I not", it said to itself.
"Perhaps my earlier identity is lost and I exist in another?"
Hail amazing thing which is extremely great and entirely wonder
for the soul was hearing the voice of its[90] own melodies yet did not understand.
Hail new things which happened to mortals
for while they were one in soul and body they became many.
Hail speakers who lost word and found words
and from one speech of one tongue possessed many.
New voices were being spoken among earthly beings
and man was amazed by man, by the change of voices.

---

[88] H: "the voice".
[89] Cf. Gen. 27,22-23.
[90] Corr.

They called to each other, man to man, and no man heeded
and the word became as no word to the speakers.
The Syrian called out to the Greek that he give him word
yet his fellow did not return word of mouth to mouth.
The Roman uttered to the Egyptian in fleshly tongue
but flesh did not suffice to discern the fleshly utterance of his fellow.
The Mede motioned to the Elamite, "Come closer"
but he was silent and turned aside as one who does not hear, for he did not hear.
The Indian drew near to the Hun to converse with him
but his words were redundant and were not received.[91]
Each man spoke to himself according to his tongue
and he interpreted for himself the (specific) meaning which the Hint had placed in him.
They became tired and were shattered when calling out one to his fellow
and voice to voice did not return the word of the mouth.
With the pangs of passion were they being lashed like one in childbirth
and the soul was not able to bear babes of word.
Like a babe speech was writhing about in the soul
and closed were the gates of the mouth for its exit.
That very Commandment which conceived word in the mind of the soul
is the one who closed the door before it so that it no longer exit.
He silenced the word within the thoughts and caused word to sprout
and the very one which was silent is the one which sprouted in a different hue.
One was that word which was divided into portions
and from it the tongue of peoples flowered like a tendril.
Like a vine it spread out its shoots to all lands
while it itself was as it was, its force remaining in the root.
Like a root did speech remain with one people
and it alone used that original one.[92]
As if by lot the commandment of the Hidden One divided them

---

[91] Cf. Acts 2,5-13 where the same peoples understand each other's tongues. The reversal of events is expressed in Hom. 46 "On Pentecost" (Mingana, II, p. 78-79). There Narsai writes that men were amazed at the various voices which they were able to understand. The Commandment, he says, which divided the tongues is the same who gave one tongue in many. At the tower of Babel the impudent ascended on high and at Pentecost the Hidden Will descended. The Hint is the one who divided and united, dividing not in wrath but in order to give the builders rest. In Babel the events took place in hidden fashion and at Pentecost they were manifest.

[92] Cf. Zeph. 3,9. So too Ephrem (Tonneau, p.66,18-22). Narsai, like Ephrem but unlike Diyarb., p. 68,24-69,16, Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,21-114,2 (who notes that the original language remained with the people who did not migrate) and Išoʿdad, p. 134,26-136,11, does not explain which was the original language.

and each man spoke according to the lot of the word which was drawn in his name.
Love and compassion were mixed in that division
and though dividing, He did not rend asunder natural love.
One lot thus befell fathers and their offspring
and one word did man, wife and children speak.
In wisdom and love did He do this, He who fashions all
so that the nature and the order of marriage not be impaired.
With great order did He divide them and unite them
like a father who bequeaths to his sons the wealth which he possesses.
In the guise of wrath did He give the wealth of His benignity
in order to raise terror among the heirs who received the force of His wise designs.
And although that voice of "Come, let us descend" was filled with anger
He dispensed peace to mankind by means of His descent.
A sign of peace did He promise to Noah and his seed
and He changed voice in the guise of anger in order to frighten man.
In the form of a sword and executioner the voice was swathed
and when He raised it up as if to kill, He sheathed it with compassion.
It was not in order to kill that He raised His sword and showed (it to) them
but rather to make known that it is not agreeable to Him to see iniquity.
Not because they built a building of iniquity did He divide them
but rather to chase out iniquity in them through division.
From the beginning He had determined (to do) that which He did
and He did it in wisdom as He is accustomed to do that which is right.
For He knew before He fashioned word in the soul
that He would cause streams[93] of words to flow from it after a time.
This division was already divided by Him before all things
and He was regarding it before heaven and earth had come into being.
It was not a new thought which urged Him to division
nor was it (so) that wrath overcame Him and He descended and gave tongues.
In the guise of wrath is He accustomed to frighten those of His household
as He had done from the beginning to the house of Adam.
There too on account of the fruit did He cause death to enter
in order to teach[94] them to do battle against enticements.
The deluge too did He say He made on account of iniquity[95]
in order to place reins on the nature of man that he not become wild.

---

[93] Corr.

[94] Corr.

[95] This is the first reason for the flood according to Cosmas, V, 89 (Wolska, II, p. 135-136), Diyarb., p. 53,15-19, Theod. b. Koni, p. 98,19-99,1 and Išoʿdad, p. 110,9-18. Cosmas notes that those who perished, being mortal, would have died anyway but their premature death limited the number of sins. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,29-30).

Because of iniquity He cursed Canaan and made him a servant[96]
so that no man mock impudently the father who begot him.
For this purpose did He descend on this occasion as well towards those of dust
so that in the guise of the voice of division of man He would pacify man.[97]
For the sake of peace did His will descend like one who descended
and it pacified men who were gathered for enmity.
He saw that they were eager to build a stronghold impudently
and He descended and demolished the building of iniquity before it grew strong.
He saw that they hastened to sally on high in order to ascend to His side
and He caused a voice to be heard and dispersed them so that they would not be tormented.
He commanded like a king who decrees a sentence upon vicious ones
and cast them into the exile of the many lands.
The commandment of the Hidden Hint went forth as a sovereign
and bound them with the harsh arms of their tongues.
Another word He placed on their mouths like a chain
and confined them in the jail of their tongues.
As if to citadels did He send them to (many) lands
so that they no more raise a stronghold of iniquity against His Lordship.
A new speech did the Hint grasp like a rod
and He drove them out of Babel as if in anger.
How very much did this commandment against the impudent ones liken
that commandment which expelled Adam from Paradise.
As in wrath He expelled them like Adam
in order to pacify the earth through Adam and through them for the life of man.[98]
For this purpose did He disperse them in lands
so that life on earth not be cut short and the killing increase.
Had they remained in one place as they had schemed

---

[96] Gen. 9,25.

[97] Išo‘dad, p. 139,1–7, similarly argues that "while God did all these things according to His Economy, He attributed it to a cause according to custom..., e.g., on account of sin death came upon Adam or the flood took place... for when He does that which serves His Economy, He proffers us beneficial teaching".

[98] According to Cosmas, V, 3 (Wolska, II, p. 440) God divided the tongues in order to put an end to the folly and to establish nations throughout the earth. Diyarb., p. 69,6–8, similarly notes that they were dispersed according to God's will in order to fill the earth. This is the same reason given for the transfer of Noah from Eden to the spacious places. Cf. Diyarb., p. 53,20–23, Theod. b. Koni, p. 99,1–3 and Išo‘dad, p. 110,18–20.

they would have become very manifold and sallied forth after blood in desire for land.
Had they remained in the land of Babel, tower of rebellion,[99]
they would have rebelled in it against justice according to their desire.
Had He not issued the verdict of their dispersion
double iniquity would have accumulated in their dwelling place.[100]
Rightly, therefore He divided and dispersed them
so that their gathering not increase iniquity and trouble peace.
They went forth from Babel to work the earth to which they had been sent
and each of them removed to the land where the Hint placed him.[101]
The divine Hint became a guide for them
and showed them the road to travel in all directions.
That Commandment which had divided them accompanied them
and with them It migrated to the lands of their dwelling.
Like a teacher did the Hint become for those babes of heart
and It instructed them to dwell in the land to which they had been sent.
The skilled scribe wrote upon the tablets of their minds
and He taught them to read properly the word in them.
They read and studied the writings of their thoughts
and they interpreted the meaning which was hidden in the speech of their tongues.
They became masters of the new speech which their heart had produced
and they established rules for the conduct of earthly life.
Along with speech they acquired support in order to live properly
and they began to meditate upon proper things of body and soul.
A benefit then, did that which had happened in the guise of wrath become
and wisely did the Beneficent One enact it against our wickedness.
With love and compassion was it wholly filled yet no man realized
and it is the cause of peace for men and spiritual ones.
The division of tongues produced an abundance of peace
and earthly and heavenly beings were enriched by it.
The spiritual ones saw the love which the Beneficent One showed to our race
and they acquired hope that there is indeed hope for our lost condition.[102]
They saw that the voice of threat was changed to serenity
and that lashes turned into benignity for those lashed.
With harsh lashes was the voice of "Come, let us descend" filled
and Compassion transformed it and descended and distributed gifts of peace.

---

[99] Or "clay".

[100] So too Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,19–20), Diyarb., p. 68,17–18 and Išo‘dad, p. 137,13–14.

[101] Gen. 11,9.

[102] This recalls the hope provided by Enoch's translation. See above Hom. I, st. 71f.

Peace did the Lover of man distribute in the guise of wrath
lest those contentious ones think that He is a lover of iniquity.
A surety of life did He mix with the voice and give them to drink
in order to depict the symbol of that which would be at the end of time.
The symbol did He depict in the division which was in the guise of wrath
of that gift which He gave to the apostles in the form of fire.[103]
That which would be did He disclose beforehand in that which was
so that once it would be revealed, it would not be foreign to onlookers.
He was going to reveal the hypostases who were with Him in the tongue of man
and He gave tongues like the tongues as a surety.
The way of peace did the voice which divided pave for us
so that we may go towards the peaceful harbor of divinity.
The disclosure of the hypostases of the Son and the Spirit did He reveal and teach us
who along with the Father divided peoples and gave tongues.
They divided that division which was in the guise of anger
and they also gave of their force in the vision of the fire.
The force of the Essence did mortals learn from the two –
that to Him belong the former and latter things.
To Him do they owe praise, to Him who fashions all
who demonstrated His love and instructed them in His secrets.

---

[103] Acts 2,3f. Išoʿ b. Nun, Q. XVIII, fol. 11r,6-16 calls the languages a type of the life-giving Christ who gave tongues to the apostles that they restore the world to truth. Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,10-13, says that the tongues are called "confusion" in Gen. 11 and "gift" in Acts, yet both are of God's grace.

Homily V

On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle

Homily V
On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle[1]

A second creation did the Creator create through Moses
that man learn that it is He who created the creation in the beginning.
A double world did His Will depict before the member of His household
in order to proclaim the force of His artistry to the forces on high.
The forces on high did His force gather on Mount Sinai
that they see His force as they saw it at the beginning which had come into being.
In that very form in which He had created the creation before their gatherings[2]
He depicted the likenesses of the temporal tabernacle and showed (them) to His servant.[3]
Through the temporal tabernacle He wished to disclose His greatness
and in its fashioning He traced the fashioning of the height and the deep.
In the form of a portrait of the two worlds He depicted it on earth[4]
according to the earthly one and the heavenly one - a double wonder.[5]
I wondered greatly at the double wonder of the Fashioner of all
who created something while there was nothing and renews it.
Out of nothing He created the[6] creatures in the beginning which He created
and He applied Himself again and renewed them through Moses.
Vigilant ones[7] and men He called to look at the reduplication of His labor
that they be witnesses to its renewal and its fashioning.

---

[1] AI: "Written by the Same (Author). Homily Forty One. On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle. Suitable for the (Feast of the) Consecration of the Church"; BCD: By the Same (Author). On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle. Suitable for the (Feast of the) Consecration of the Church.

[2] For the creation of the world in the presence of the angels see Gignoux, II, 231-290.352-367. For a related text in Theodore, cf. Sachau, p. 3,16-4,13.

[3] Ex. 25,9.

[4] Theodoretus (Fernández Marcos - Sáenz-Badillos, I, p. 140,11), like Narsai, calls the tabernacle the εἰκών or portrait (syriac *yuqnā*) of the two worlds.

[5] The notion of the tabernacle as a representation of the two worlds, heavenly and earthly, is derived from Theodore (e.g. Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.1; Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p. 326, fol. 82v,5-14) and is common in East-Syrian exegesis. Cf., e.g., Cosmas, II, 35 (Wolska, I, p. 341) and III, 16 (Wolska, I, p. 453), Cyrus, p. 46,28-47,12, Theod. b. Koni, p. 154,20-21, Išo'dad, II, p. 46,23-27 and Anon. Com., fol. 47r,13-15. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 152,9-12), on the other hand, says that "likeness" was used for the tabernacle because God was going to "make it pass away in order to make room for the church which is the perfect exemplar and eternal". The term was also meant to make the tabernacle venerable, "because it is the likeness of the tabernacle in heaven".

[6] Corr.

[7] Another name for angels. Cf. Dan. 4,10.14.20 and Murray, "Angelology".

A likeness which didn't exist did He depict on the mountain as if it existed
that in nothing they see something out of nothing.
Artfully He depicted likenesses without structure
that in their constuction He assure His servants of His creative force.
The truth of His name did He trace in an appearance and show them
so that they not doubt about His Essence which is without beginning.
His name He set first as a foundation for the building of His labor[8]
and upon it He completed heaven and earth and all that is in them.
His name, moreover, He caused to be held in the form of a tool in the hands of Moses
and He chiseled words and built upon them the truth of His name.[9]
With words He taught him to edify His force into scriptures
and as with beams He strengthened them by means of letters.
A house out of something did the builder of reverence of truth build
and likened it to the disposition of that fashioning which is out of nothing.
Out of nothing had the world been created by its Fashioner
and he too imitated that nothing and made something.
The seemly dwelling of the origin of the world did the Hint depict for him
so that he imitate it[10] and make the tabernacle the likeness of the worlds.
That very Will which created the creation out of nothing
(is the one who) showed him the seemly appearance which was like something.
"Look and make," said the Force of the Maker to him,
"according to that spiritual likeness which I have depicted before you.[11]
Look, depict well the seemly portrait of the two worlds
and[12] place it on earth before onlookers that they consider it.
Make one tabernacle according to the type by which I made heaven and earth
and once it is fashioned, divide it in two without division.[13]
Hang a veil between the one and the other and separate them[14]
just as the firmament which I spread out[15] separates the two fashionings.
With a garment of water I divided my work into two dwelling places;[16]

---

[8] Gen. 1:1; Ex. 20:1. Cf. Gignoux, II, 15-22 for the precedence of God's name over His creation.

[9] Ex. 31,18; 34,1.7-8.

[10] Corr.

[11] Ex. 25,40.

[12] Corr.

[13] Ex. 26,30-33.

[14] Ex. 26,33. Cosmas, II, 35 (Wolska, I, p. 341), Theod. b Koni, p. 155,17-18, Išoʿdad, II, p. 46,28-47,1 and Anon. Com., fol. 47r,26-28 make an analogy between the veil and the firmament.

[15] Gen. 1,6-8.

[16] Narsai's theories of the formation of the firmament may be found in Gignoux, I, 47-56 and III, 143-156.

you too, make for yourself a hanging and divide your labor.
Spread curtains on earth and make them firm[17]
and instead of walls, surround them with hewn uprights.[18]
A tabernacle and a tabernacle shall there be in the tabernacle which you fashion
in that form of the (one) world and the (other) world from one world.
The one world and the other, temporal and future, did my Will fashion;
you too, fashion a tabernacle and a tabernacle in that very form.
The temporal world did I fill with the time of transitory things;
look accurately and juxtapose each thing to the other.
In the outer tabernacle place earthly furnishings
and in that inner one place the way of life of spiritual things.
Spiritual and bodily things dispose and make
so that the work of your hands liken the work of my hands."
Hail Maker who made worlds out of nothing
who teaches His servants to be like him in making something.
Hail painter who formed[19] creatures when they were not
who applied Himself again and traced them before the son of Amram.
Hail He whose eternity is hidden in His eternity
whose Force uttered manifest voices before His attendants.
Hail to you, you too, o man who is himself molded from earth
whose intellect grew so as to imitate your Fashioner.
Hail to you Moses, feeble mud drawn from water[20]
whose clay became one who creates creation like the Creator.
Hail to you stutterer, impeded in the speech of the word of the mouth[21]
whose word surpassed the speed of men and heavenly beings.
Along with the Divine word the slow one ran
and his tongue flew over things not visible to him.
The word of the Spirit uttered to him spiritually
and formed him with intellect in order to accomplish words in deeds.
In deeds he accomplished everything which was shown to him
by the force of that Force perfect in Its Essence and Its creative force.
A temporal tabernacle did he make on earth as commanded
and he divided it in two like the division of the height and the deep.
According to the disposition of the worlds, this one and the future, did he dispose and make it
and he gathered and filled it with the form of life here and there.
Two states of life did he show man by means of its disposition
and he taught them to preserve the order placed in the two.

---

[17] Ex. 26,1-13.

[18] Ex. 26,15-29.

[19] The Syriac for "painter" and "formed" are of the same root, *ṣwr*.

[20] This is the etymology of Moses's name following Ex. 2,10.

[21] Ex. 4,10.

85 In that outer one he constituted them with bodily things
and in that inner one he instructed them with spiritual things.
Bodily and spiritual things did he place in the two
according to the composition of man of body and spirit.
The body he permitted to enter at all hours into that outer one
90 and into the inner one the soul of all men (he permitted to enter) through the High Priest.
With the High Priest each was entering by means of the mind
in that the body was not able to enter as long as it was earthly.[22]
Spiritually was that inner tabernacle depicted
and even the High Priest was entering it as a symbol of spiritual beings.
95 Symbolically was the likeness of that outer one traced
and corresponding to its likeness so was the continuous access.[23]
Only at the things belonging to it did He allow the body to look
and it was restricted from examining spiritual things.
With the state of bodily life was that outer tabernacle filled
100 and bodily things and sustainment of the body were placed in it.
Dead sacrifices were being sacrificed on its altars[24]
and rows of bread were arranged on its table.[25]
A candelabrum of gold, portion of clay[26] was fixed upon it[27]
and atop it the form of the luminaries and the number of days.[28]
105 The entire course of the system of the year was contained in it;
the force of the elements was hidden in the types which were depicted in it.[29]
Corresponding to the inhabited world, the tabernacle was extended to the four corners[30]

---

[22] Lev. 16,17; Heb. 9,7.

[23] Heb. 9,6. So too Cyrus, p. 47,4-12 and Cosmas, III, 16 (Wolska, I, p. 453).

[24] Lev. 1,1f.

[25] Ex. 25,30.

[26] This is perhaps a reference to its having been cast. Cf. Išo'dad, II, p. 48,14-16 and Anon. Com., fol. 47v,9-14.

[27] Ex. 25,31; 26,35.

[28] Ex. 25,32-37. Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27,n.1) also sees the lamps as representing the number of days. For the lampstand as representative of the luminaries (probably based on Ex. 30,8) as well as the days of the week, see Cosmas, II, 36 (Wolska, I, p. 343), III, 52 (Wolska, I, p. 489), V, 33 (Wolska, II, p. 59) (for the days) and V, 20 and 27 (Wolska, II, p. 41 and 51) (for the luminaries), Išo'dad, II, p. 47,20-23, Anon. Com., fol. 48v,22-24 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 155,23-156,4. According to the latter the six branches are the six days following the first during which light was created and the seven lamps are the weeks of the month.

[29] The elements are usually said to be depicted by the four colors used in the tabernacle (Ex. 25,4). Cf. Cosmas, V, 35 (Wolska II, p. 63 and *ibid.*,n.35^1), Išo'dad, II, p. 47,26(-48,3) and the parallel in Anon. Com., fol. 47v,9-14.

[30] Ex. 26,18.20.22.

and it was disposed according to the disposition of the months of the year.[31]
With great order was its disposition filled for one looking at it
110 and corresponding to the world were its statutes too established.
Along with the world was the order of its course being transmitted
and according to the seasons were the furnishings arranged in it.
In the north was placed the altar of sacrifices and table of bread[32]
which were disclosing the remittance of sins and change of seasons.
115 The change of seasons were the rows on the table[33] presenting
and the months of the year were circling about in their rows.[34]
In six rows the twelve months were being indicated
and each of them consisted of two months.[35]
The months engender the germination of seeds and the accretion of fruits
120 and doubtless were the rows too arranged in this order.
By bread does the life of man subsist as long as he is an earthly being
and on account of that was bread alone placed on the table.
In this form were the rows arranged in the north
that they look out over the disposition of the luminaries.[36]
125 As a symbol of the luminaries was the candelabrum looking at them with its flames[37]
and they towards it as seedlings[38] in the direction of the sun.
On the south side the Hint who set the law set it
and it faced north in the manner of the sphere of the sun.
Along with the sun was it rotating - not in rotation
130 but rather in the disposition of the activity of its rays.
The entire disposition of the luminaries was disposed in it
and the number of days and the change of months were contained in it.
The week of days was depicted in it and it in the week[39]

---

[31] See below, st. 115-116.

[32] Ex. 26,35.

[33] Corr.

[34] According to Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.2) the table represents the yearly cycle of four seasons. Anon. Com., fol. 47v,24-27 sees a parallel between the twelve breads and the twelve months and four seasons which sustain the world (see below st. 119 and Theodore, *op. cit.*). In Lev. 24,6 the bread is said to be distributed in two rows of six. Išo'dad probably wants to establish a more exact parallel when writing of both two rows of six breads and four rows of three representing the two main or four seasons respectively (II, p. 47,10-13). However, the distribution of the breads in four rows or into the four corners is already attested in Cosmas, II, 36 (Wolska, I, p. 343), III, 51 (Wolska, I, p. 487) and V, 34 (Wolska, II, p. 63).

[35] Lev. 24,6.

[36] So too Cosmas, II, 36 (Wolska, I, p. 343), III, 51 (Wolska, I, p. 487) and V, 33 (Wolska, II, p. 59) as well as Išo'dad, II, p. 48,17-18.

[37] Ex. 26,35.

[38] Cosmas, V, 20 (Wolska, II, p. 41) compares the bread to the annual crops (which ripen in the sun). See below, st. 309.

and seven lamps according to the number of days were atop it.
According to the number of days was the disposition of the flames upon it enumerated
and it was disposed in the likeness of the week which is not wanting.
Six branches were fixed upon it and it was in the middle[40]
just like the days of the fashioning of the universe with the Sabbath at the end.[41]
That fashioning of six days was confined in it
and it was holy like the Sabbath day which the Hint had hallowed.
A second Sabbath was being enumerated in the temporal tabernacle
and the flames upon it were like the luminaries on high.
In the outer sanctuary only was its light being shown
also corresponding to the sun's shining in the dwelling place here alone.
For the Holy of Holies the light from it was not necessary
just as the dwelling place above needs no luminary.
In the dwelling place above was that inner tabernacle depicted
and it was restricted in entrance in its likeness.
In the likeness of the height did it serve although it was on earth
and its furnishings too were relating future things.
As for the incense offering and also the censer which were placed in it[42]
they were prophesying confession in purity of soul.[43]
With the incense of spices did the High Priest enter it as well[44]
and once a year he made expiation in it for himself and for the people.[45]
The expiation of sins and the spirit of revelation did he receive in it
and with awe and love were his entrance as well as his departure filled.
With awe was he filled in that he dreaded[46] his sins
and with love was he filled by his entering to receive compassion.
Compassion and judgment were being disclosed by its furnishings
and about events which had taken place and would be were they relating.

---

[39] Ex. 25,37.

[40] Ex. 25,32.

[41] So too Anon. Com., fol. 48v,27-49r,1. Theod. b. Koni, p. 156,2-4 makes a distinction between the first day upon which light was created and the other six. Išo'dad (Gibson, V, 1, p. 167), in his commentary on Heb. 9,8, notes that "some say that it (i.e. the lamp stand) is the sign of the Day God made, but our rest is on the eighth day". The "some" to whom he refers includes Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27,n.11) who says that the candelabrum is a symbol of the Day God made.

[42] Ex. 30,1; Heb. 9,4.

[43] The incense censer, says Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27,n.1), is the symbol of righteousness which pleases God. Išo'dad (Gibson, V, 1, p. 167), embellishes upon this, adding that righteousness is sweet and acceptable to God as is a sweet odor to us (cf. Išo'dad, p. 122,5-13 on the pleasant odor of Noah's offer).

[44] Ex. 30,7-9; Lev. 16,12.

[45] Ex. 30,10; Lev. 16,17.24; Heb. 9,7.

[46] BCD: "while dreading".

The urn and the staff were a memorial of those things of the past:
the eating of manna[47] and the election of the priests from the house of Levi.[48]
(So was) the ark[49] the symbol of the heavenly ministry[50]
and the seraphim[51] - the accomplishment of immortal life.
In the plate[52] of gold,[53] the name of which is expounded as "expiation",
the expiation of sins which is through our Savior[54] was being expounded.[55]
By the name of expiation was that plate[56] called
not that it expiates but rather that it is the symbol of the Expiator.
The symbol of expiation was hidden in the plate[57] of the law
and it was awaiting the time when the Expiator of sins would reveal it.
For the rational plate was the dumb plate longing
for the time when He would come and accomplish its symbol in deed.

---

[47] Ex. 16, esp. 32-34.

[48] Nu. 17,16-26; Heb. 9,4. For Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27.n.1) the urn is a memorial of the time when the Israelites were fed by manna and the staff is the service of God fulfilled by the cult. So too Išo'dad, II, p. 47,7-9. However, in his commentary on Hebrews (Gibson, V, 1, p. 167-168), he says the urn is the body of the virgin from which sprang the bread of life and the rod is the type of our Savior. Others, he notes, say the urn is a symbol of the memorial of the time when they ate manna. Theod. b. Koni, p. 155,11-16, sees in the manna a sign of the food of angels or spiritual nourishment and in the staff the conception of Mary without seed or intercourse. The latter also serves as a sign for the Jews, that they cease contending against the priesthood.

[49] Cf. Ex. 25,10-22; Heb. 9,4.

[50] According to Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27,n.1) the ark is the symbol of the worship and honoring of the Divine. Theod. b. Koni, p. 155, 4-5 says it is a symbol of either the Divinity or the Divinity and the humanity. Anon. Com., fol. 47v,2-3 writes that the book of the law in the ark symbolizes divine knowledge while according to "others" (*ibid.*,4-5) the ark is the humanity and the Divinity. But Yoḥannan of Bet Rabban says that it is a type of Mt. Sinai (*ibid.*,20-22). For Išo'dad, II, p. 47,3 the ark is the symbol of Divinity and *ibid.*, p. 48,8-10 it is the type of Mt. Sinai. A further distinction is found in Išo'dad (Gibson, V, 1, p. 167) where the divinity is said to be in the gold and Christ's humanity in the wood of the ark. The plate called the mercy seat is the Lord's humanity.

[51] The biblical text (Ex. 25,18-22; Heb. 9,5) refers to cherubim and not seraphim. Narsai probably has Is. 6,2-3 in mind. Cf. Narsai, Hom. 58, "On Isaiah's Vision" (Mingana, II, p. 131-144).

[52] Corr.

[53] Ex. 25,17; Lev. 16,2; Heb. 9,4. Pesh. Ex. 25,27 reads *ḥussāyā* or propitiation and LXX ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, propitiatory - covering. Cf. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *Bible Alex.*, II, p.256-257, n. on Ex. 25,17 and Išo'dad, II, transl., p. 63,n.1.

[54] Rom. 3,23-25.

[55] The expiation plate is traditionally linked to Rom. 3,25 in East-Syrian exegesis. So too Cosmas, V, 36 and 112 (Wolska, II, p. 63-65; 169), Išo'dad, II, p. 47,4-5 and *idem* (Gibson, V, 1, p. 168), Theod. b. Koni, p. 155,5-6 and Anon. Com., fol. 47v,3-4. The latter, however, alternatively says that the plate is a symbol of the clouds on Sinai (fol. 47v,27-48r,2).

[56] Corr.

[57] Corr.

For the expiation of sins in deed was it longing
for it was not equal to the sins of human nature.[58]
Its force was too feeble to efface the iniquity of man
and it did not suffice to undo death from mortals.
Only the name of the Expiator's expiation did it possess
and it glittered like pictures without life force.
Metaphoric names without deeds did the cast plate assume:
"expiation" which is the symbol of expiation.
About He who is coming was it prophesying by means of its epithets
and as with a finger was it pointing to the day of His manifestation.
By the name "plate" it was relating His bodiliness
and by "expiation", the force of the Essence which was dwelling in Him.
There was no force of expiation of sins in its muteness
nor was a man able to revive men.
The Force of the Creator reenforced the symbol and its fulfillment
and by the force of His Force He gave life force to mortality.
The mortality of man was being proclaimed by the plate's muteness
and by the revelations which occurred through it,[59] the Word in the body.[60]
The spirit of revelation was breathing into its muteness
just as the divine Will in a man who is of us.
Through it did the priest of the people learn the symbol of hidden things
just as we the Force of the Essence through one of our race.
In the Holy of Holies the dumb one was placed above the ark[61]
just as its Lord too was going to dwell on high.[62]
Dumb cherubim were extolling its muteness
in the manner of the gatherings of heavenly beings (who extolled) the Cause of our lives.
Through the Cause of our lives was that (thing) of[63] cast gold being honored
and towards the expiation in Him its mercy[64] too was looking.
And if this is not so, let the Israelite - minister of symbols - say
what the cause of this expiation in the mute one is.
Why was it placed in the Holy of Holies like something holy
disclosing the symbol of hidden things and the expiation of sins?
Why was the priest in need of its muteness upon entering[65]
and why by its means did he learn to disclose symbols?

---

[58] Heb. 9,9.
[59] Ex. 25,22; Lev. 16,2.
[60] Thus Išoʻdad (Gibson, V, 1, p. 167), who says that the voice of God heard by the priests designates "God the Word who dwelled in a man, spoke and brought about all things".
[61] Ex. 25,21.
[62] Heb. 9,24.
[63] BC: "was cast gold".
[64] Read (?) "expiation".
[65] Lev. 16,2.12-14.

Why didn't the cherubim relate, even if dumb
for lo, it is written that from it was transmitted the voice of revelation.[66]
Why didn't even the priest enter into it at all times[67]
and upon entering, why did he only enter with incense?[68]
Why was the voice transmitted to him through the dumb one
and not from on high, from the place where the Force of the Essence is?
Why altogether was it through the mediation of a lifeless plate
and why did the rational one bow his head before the mute one?
Look, o Jew, into the meaning of the disclosure which is meant by your scriptures
and see that properly have my thoughts questioned the question of the symbol.
With question is even the narrative of the tabernacle of your sacrifices[69] filled
as to why it was called holy place and holy place.
Why was the outer one served by the blood of animals
and that inner one only by incense and but once a year?
If the mystery of that entry was filled with benefit
why did he not do it every day so that he be benefited every day?
Every day is right for those filled with sin to be expiated
and at all times to hear the voice which effaces iniquity.
No, Hebrew, it is not as is written;
a different meaning is hidden in the letters and[70] the voice which issues forth.
Your outer sanctuary, the earthly dwelling is disclosed in it
and that inner one, a symbol of the spiritual fashioning is it.
The altar of your sacrifices is the symbol of that sacrifice which is on behalf of our lives
even your expiation is the shadow of the expiation of our sins.[71]
That from that plate the voice towards you was being spoken,[72]
that is the force of the help which flows to man through a man.
Cherubim of wood which were hovering over expiation -
they are the heavenly beings who serve Him, the firstfruits of our lives.[73]

---

[66] Ex. 25,22; Lev. 16,2; Nu. 7,89.
[67] Lev. 16,2; Heb. 9,17.
[68] Lev. 16,12-13.
[69] Corr.
[70] BCD: "of".
[71] Heb. 8,5.
[72] Nu. 7,89.
[73] Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p.27,n.1), unlike Narsai, sees the cherubim as the invisible powers who serve God to accomplish that which is useful for us. Both Anon. Com., fol. 48r,7-9 and Išoʻdad, II, p. 47,6-7 say that they are either the forces serving God or the two angels accompanying Christ. Theod. b. Koni, p. 128,2-12 and Išoʻdad (Gibson, V, 1, p. 168) offer the second explanation only. Cf. Išoʻdad, p. 159,6-7.11-13.

That once a year the High Priest entered it,
that entrance which our firstfruits entered was depicted by him.
Into the sanctuary on high was the symbol of our salvation going to enter
and through His entrance that entrance was being prepared.
An envoy was the priesthood of your people before His coming
and this does it announce in the sacrifices[74] of sheep and blood of calves.[75]
A guide was your temporal tabernacle by means of its division
and it showed the two fashionings, of the world and of the future.
If this is not so, why was there a tabernacle and a tabernacle for one state of life
and why a holy place and a Holy of Holies, manifest and hidden?
Why in the one the libation of the blood of animals
and in the other incense and the form of spiritual vigilant ones?
Why were you excluded by the door of your Holy of Holies
and did not enter to consider glorious things?
Why did not even your priest enter perpetually?
and upon entering, why didn't he bring sacrifices with him?
Your sanctuary testifies that that which I have said is disclosed in it
and your[76] Holy of Holies ratifies my words in deed.
It altogether proclaims the proclamation of our lives
and as with a finger it points through its symbols to the truth which shines forth.
His great shining forth was the splendor of your books desirous of receiving
and now that He has shone forth, why do you exclude them from looking at Him.
See, o contentious one, how luminous His lumination is
for He chased away the darkness of idolatry and it vanished and ceased.
Forsooth, o foolish one, remove the veil from your mind
and see the world which walks by the light of His Gospel.
Forsooth, o proud one, descend from the height of your contention
and look at creation which is extolling the mark which you rejected.
The entire creation calls out His glory without satiety
and the four corners weave for His name the crown of victory.
All the just were consoled by the symbol of His coming
and the books of the spirit were relating His manifestation.
Priests, according to His order were their canons ordained
and kings, through His rank, were being honored in their dominions.
Through the greatness of His rank the law and its observances were magnified
and were it not for Him it would not even have been given a name.

---

[74] BCD: "sacrifices".
[75] Heb. 9,12-14.
[76] D: "the".

In His name was it being honored with the spirit of revelations
and the revelations too were recounting His manifestation.[77]
Him did the priest worship symbolically before that covering
and the covering itself was even filling the place of His being.
With the blood of animals the sprinkling of His blood was disclosed[78]
but what am I saying that He was disclosed, for He Himself was expiating!
Through the promise to the just the truth of His coming was assured
and through their sacrifices His passion and His death were celebrated.
Him was the expectation of the law expecting
and Moses attests who fashioned the tabernacle as a symbol of His revelation.
With the symbol of His revelation was the temporal[79] tabernacle filled
and as with a finger was it pointing to Him through deeds.[80]
Towards Him were the holy place and the holy place and all that was in them looking,
for the time when He would come and perfect them by His holiness.
For the holy offering which was of Him were the dead sacrifices longing
for the time when He would sacrifice His living being and do away with them.
The lamb, by its sacrifice, was relating His being sacrificed[81]
and far more than thunder did it raise its voice in the mouths of those who ate it.
Through the food of the dumb one, the food of His body was disclosed
and in its paltry blood, His precious blood was declared.
The sprinkling of its blood preserved the people from harmful things[82]
and if the blood of a dumb one sufficed to preserve, how much the more that of a rational being.
Through the blood of one endowed with speech was the Beneficent One going to redeem mankind
and He sent the dumb one to pave the way before His coming.
In the temple of His body He caused all to dwell and He (did so) willfully[83]
and He fashioned the tabernacle and called it the holy place and the Holy of Holies.
As a symbol of the fashioning of His body and His soul was the tabernacle depicted
and bodily and spiritually was it being served.

---

[77] "Manifestation" and "revelations" are of the same root, *gl'*.
[78] Rom. 3,25.
[79] Corr.
[80] Corr.
[81] The lamb is apparently that of Passover which is the symbol of Christ, the lamb of God (Jo. 1,29).
[82] Ex. 12,7.
[83] Jo. 1,14.

Physical and spiritual things were placed in it
corresponding to (the fact of) His going to gather towards Him angels and men.
To His peaceful harbor was He steering the people at all times
and as in the ocean He bound them with the hope in Him.
Towards the location of His shining forth was the mark of its observances directed
and as at a star was it looking at the seemliness of His light.
With a fixed disposition were the holy place and the Holy of Holies filled
and corresponding to the world were they pitched on earth towards the four corners.
The place of the sun was the branched candelabrum filling in it[84]
and by its lights were the rites of sacrifices being fulfilled.
The sun, by its warmth, ripens fruit and causes seeds to germinate
and in that very likeness it too in the tabernacle, the second world.[85]
In the outer tabernacle was it fixed, it and its tapers
corresponding to the sun's course being confined to the dwelling place here.
The likeness which the son of the Hebrews likened likens greatly
and no man is able to liken more than this.
"See and make in the form of the likeness which I have depicted before you"[86]
and this is the wonder, that while there was nothing he imitated something.
There was nothing in the likeness which the Hint depicted for him on the mountain
and who would not marvel at his having likened a likeness which has no likeness!
With the mind did he look at that which he saw spiritually[87]
and it is wonderful that while seeing with his faculties he completed with his senses.
A wondrous sight did the seer of hidden things see
and far grander was it than the comprehension of earthly beings.
Very many were the measurements of the temporal tabernacle
and abundant and variegated were its divisions as well.
According to measurements which were not, did he make those which were
and according to divisions which were not firm did he make firm its disposition.
He made it in the disposition corresponding to the dispositions which he saw on the mountain

---

[84] Ex. 30,8.

[85] See above, st. 126 and Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.2).

[86] Ex. 25,40.

[87] Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.1) says that Moses saw the furnishings in his spirit by means of a prophetic vision. Cosmas, II, 35 (Wolska, I, p. 341) says that Moses was guided by divine inspiration.

and accurately did he trace its likenesses without change.
O, how accurate is the image of your likenesses, son of the Hebrews
and its likeness is like that nothing which was shown to you.
O, how luminous is the color which the Spirit mixed in your words
and its hue resembles the seemly hue of the image of the worlds.
O, how seemly is the way which you prepared among earthly beings
and doubtless that voice which spoke with you prepared it through your mouth.
O, how true is the name of the Essence which you proclaimed on earth
for It exposed and revealed the shamefulness of those which are no Gods.
O, how the word of your mouth did run, you of impeded tongue
for it surpassed the worlds and repeated the disposition of the Fashioner of the worlds.
O, how astute is your mind, man, in seeing hidden things
for it applied its faculties to consider that which is without appearance.
Who would not marvel at your word, Moses drawn from water
for instead of water you filled the earth with words of the spirit.
Who would not say that the Spirit spoke expediently through your mouth
for according to its prompting you expounded His symbols among earthly beings.
Who would not praise the Force which reenforced the faculties of your soul
for it is He who created the creation in the beginning and disclosed it through your mouth.
Who would not believe that He Himself instilled in you the force of wise designs
and upon His command dumb natures fulfilled your word.[88]
Who would not call you God of the earth, as you were designated[89]
for upon your word, works were accomplished on earth.
Seemly is the name by which you were named, o mortal
and rightly was the word towards you fulfilled in deed.
With a metaphoric name were you called by the name of God
and in deed that which you announced came to be, o great prophet.
For all your words there was fulfillment as you prophesied
and not one letter fell short of being accomplished.
He whom you announced, great prophet, fulfilled your words
and sealed your book[90] with the seal of the blood of His limbs.
Because of Him the Spirit uttered hidden symbols through you

---

[88] A reference to the wonders and plagues accomplished through Moses in Egypt (Ex. 7,10–10,23).

[89] Ex. 4:16; 7:1. Narsai calls Moses "God" in Hom. 2 (Mingana, I, p. 38) and Hom. 72 (Mingana, II, p. 297–298), in the latter because he caused fire and hail to mix and irrational ones obeyed him as they would God.

[90] Corr.

and Him were they awaiting, for the time when He would come and disclose them.
Towards Him was the fashioning of the temporal tabernacle looking as well
for He was going to be a pure temple for the Force of the Essence.
For a short while the tabernacle served the name of the Creator
and He, without end, is being served in Him in holy fashion.
In the holiness of His body the Hidden One dwells willfully
and in Him He is hallowed by spiritual and bodily beings.
The entire creation worships its Fashioner in His body
and cherishes Him like a divine temple.
His body is the holy place and the faculties of His soul the Holy of Holies
and in His likenesses were the holy place and the Holy of Holies depicted.
Holy place and holy place was the temporal tabernacle called
as one would say, in body and soul was He going to be.
Through the outer tabernacle, the bodiliness was being disclosed
and through the inner one, the hidden soul was being proclaimed.
Through body and soul a man becomes a complete man
and in that very likeness was the tabernacle depicted in two tabernacles.
According to the fashioning of man did Moses fashion that fashioning;
Come, let us see in it the fashioning of man which took place through a man.

Homily VI

On the Brazen Serpent

Homilly VI
On the Brazen Serpent[1]

A covenant of love did the Lord convene with Abraham
and He promised him that He would redeem his offspring from servitude.[2]
A servant was his offspring going to be in the land of Canaan[3]
and He showed him beforehand that He would liberate them by the force of His greatness.
The force of His greatness did He show to the Egyptians in Egypt[4]
and against their will He[5] accomplished His will towards Abraham.
With force and wealth[6] did He bring them out of Egypt
and without fear did He cause them to abide in the fearful desert.
In the place of the desert did He cause those haters of peace to dwell
so that by means of the desert He would pacify the desert of their minds.
For the sake of peace did He cause them to dwell in the desert outside
so that perhaps they would alienate themselves from occupation with shameful things.
He saw that in the culivated land they would not depart[7] from hateful things
and He expelled them to a place remote from humanity.
With a change of place He believed that they would change their deeds
although not unaware of their contention in the desert and in the cultivated land.[8]
Evil custom had accustomed them to unseemly things
and they did not wish to be like to the seemly likeness which He had shown them.
With lovely things was He desirous of occupying their minds

---

[1] AI:"By the Same (Author). Homily Thirty Nine. On the Brazen Serpent. Suitable for the Invention (of the Cross)"; BCD: "By the Same (Author). On the Brazen Serpent. Suitable for the Invention (of the Cross)"; FG: "Homily Thirty Six. On the Brazen Serpent which Blessed Moses Made. And to be Read on the Festival of the Invention of ... the Venerable Cross" followed by "My Brothers:"; E is the same as FG but omits "thirty six".

[2] Gen. 15,14.

[3] Gen. 15,13. EFG: "A servant was it going to be of the offspring of Canaan".

[4] Cf. Ex. 7-11.

[5] EF: "they", i.e. the Egyptians.

[6] Ex. 12,35-36.

[7] EFG: "they were not tamed".

[8] EFG read st. 16 differently and add two more stiches: "while His pleasantness was not unaware of the error in them. He knew them before they came into being, that is, what they were like, and manifest to Him was their contention in the desert and in the cultivated land".

and He multiplied mighty acts and wonders[9] that they perhaps be changed.[10]
With manna and quail He sustained them while they did not weary themselves[11]
and from the rock He caused drink to flow and delighted them.[12]
The shadow-giving cloud did He stretch out as a tent over their heads[13]
and in the likeness of a candelabrum He fixed the light-filled column.[14]
With light was their dwelling place filled night and day
and along with the visible light, (was) the light of truth.
By light and light the hateful of soul were delighted
and although they were seemly, they were not as seemly[15] as they could have been.
Seemly was the visible light to the eyes of the body
and more than it was truth seemly to the eyes of the soul.
Body and soul[16] were considering the two lights
and while they saw, they did not truly see.
In great peace were they abiding there where they abided
and yet there was no desert whose vacuity was as harsh as their thoughts.
The desert in its peace was rebuking the desert in them
for it was pacified but they did not repent[17] from evil doings.
Evil it too had been before the people inhabited its midst
and by means of the people, peace came to rule over its evilness.
Desirable was its peace and longing were men for its peace
and there was none who troubled and none who harmed its peacefulness.
Tempered was the venom of the reptiles dwelling[18] in it
and while they were harmful, they were not harmful as they could have been.
Without harm did the offspring of Abram inhabit it
yet they did not discern who was preserving them from harmful things.
With great ingratitude did the ungrateful ones act ingratefully towards the Grace among them[19]
and having seen this, the desert reverted to the custom to which it was wont.
Evil custom forced it to liken that which it was wont to be

---

[9] Ex. 34,10.
[10] EFG: "that they might be strengthened".
[11] Ex. 16, esp. 12-13; 1 Cor. 10,3.
[12] Ex. 17,1-6; 1 Cor. 10,4.
[13] 1 Cor. 10,1.
[14] Ex. 13,21-22.
[15] EFG: "to them they were not seemly".
[16] EG: "With body and soul were they considering".
[17] Corr.
[18] Corr.
[19] 1 Cor. 10,9.

and discord[20] banished its peace that it not be peaceful.
The voice of blasphemy aroused the reptile[21] which dwelled in it
and hateful murmuring opened its mouth in order to sting.[22]
The venom of the (evil) inclination breached the pool of the reptile's venom
and the reptile[23] sallied forth to subjugate rational beings.
Sin opened the door of the Commandment before the mute ones
and taught them to set themselves over those endowed with speech.
"The people sinned," is written in the book of the great Moses[24]
"and the Lord incited the serpents to sting them".[25]
To God did scripture attribute the harm of the dumb one
in order to inform those lashed of the Force of His Lordship.[26]
His force instructed the undiscerning serpents
and He quieted them and aroused them as He pleased.
When it pleased Him He placed the seal of silence upon their mouths
and again, when it pleased Him He set them loose to bite.
Not (really) pleasing to Him was that which I said was pleasing to Him;
the unpleasantness of the people forced Him to change.
The shamefulness of the people did that Hint who is entirely pleasing, see
and it did not please Him to consider its shamefulness.
The ulcer of iniquity did He see in the camp in which it camped
and He gave it as food to the contemptible reptile as if with word(s).[27]
Unnaturally[28] did the mute one cry out to rational beings,
"Look at me! - not at me but rather at the Force which bound me and set me loose.
The Force which created me restrained me from harming your discernment
but because you did not discern Him,[29] He set me loose that I set straight your ignorance."[30]
The arms of wrath did the reptile don against the discerning ones
and it began to shoot the arrows of its venom at the ranks of the people.
Like a (two edged) sword the impudent ones[31] unsheathed their tongues

---

[20] Corr.
[21] Corr.
[22] Corr.
[23] EFG: "the dumb one".
[24] Nu. 21,4-5.7.
[25] Nu. 21,6
[26] EG: "chastisement".
[27] EFG read stich 68 differently and add two stiches: "and He loathed it and gave it as food to the contemptible reptile. As if with word(s) He spoke with that which does not possess word, and it began to hold forth with bites as if with words".
[28] EFG: "By means of its harm".
[29] Corr.
[30] The reptiles, according to Anon. Com., fol. 88v,15-21, didn't appear out of nowhere as in the case of the plagues, but were restrained by God in the desert and released when the Israelites murmured in order to bite them. See st. 41-42 and 61-62 above.

and without mercy they stabbed the fierce[32] of soul.
They made harsh war against body and against mind
and the one they killed and the other they expulsed from amidst its dwelling place.
The vengeance of iniquity did the mute ones exact from those endowed with speech
and they silenced them from blasphemy against the Creator.
The Creator Himself taught them, the undiscerning ones,
to avenge the vengeance of His dishonor on the discerning ones.
Greatly[33] did the undiscerning ones discern in order to discern greatly
and perhaps those possessing word did not discern like they did.
Through their discernment He instructed the people stubborn of mind
and with their venom He purified the venom of their thoughts.
With the evil venom of idolatry was their heart filled
and the Benevolent One tempered it with a venom more evil than their venom.
Venom with venom did His force temper wisely
and the venom of the serpents vanquished the venom of man.
He showed great order in that which is without order
and in its confusion He ordained an order which confounded the (evil) inclination.
A whip of anger did His Hint enclose in the mouth of the mute ones
and instead of the hand, with the mouth He lashed those who were lashed.
To harsh lashes He submitted the people hard of heart
and its lashers He made the vipers more fierce than it.
To torturers bereft of compassion did He deliver them
that with their ferocity He soften the hearts of those hardened by iniquity.
Like exacting ones they circulated amidst the the camp
and they tracked down iniquity wherever it was hidden.
As guilty ones were those who commited iniquity concealing themselves
for they sensed that the reptiles were avenging their guilt.
The guilty ones were vanquished and were unable to withstand those exacting
and they raised fingers to the creditor, "Have mercy, do not destroy!"
The Clement One had mercy, not by persuasion but in love[34]
and He called to His servant and taught him to prepare a medicine for his people.
"Make a serpent," the Lord said to Moses His servant,

---

[31] EFG: "vipers" (Nu. 21,6).
[32] Fierce (*ḥarmā*) is a play on viper or basilisk (*ḥarmānā*) of Nu. 21,6. See st. 96 below.
[33] EG: "Rightly".
[34] EFG: "His love".

"and set it as a sign and memorial that it heal[35] the people.[36]
Construct a snake according to the constitution of the serpents
that it wholly be like a living serpent.
Make a lifeless serpent in a form which is like the real one
so that in its lifelessness it will still the venom of the serpents."
The humble one[37] obeyed the voice of the commandment which spoke to him
and he believed and confirmed and fashioned and made a cast serpent.[38]
The one endowed with speech cast the likeness of the reptile[39] without understanding
and he raised it up and hung it in the midst of the camp of the tribes of the people.
In the middle of the people he hung the harmful likeness
so that those who were bitten[40] look at it and question its cause.[41]
In the middle of the domain of the holy place he placed the life-giving medicine[42]
and he turned the gaze of all men towards it that they consider it.
Like a mirror he affixed it upon wood[43] before their eyes
so that its appearance be manifest to body and mind.
A new appearance did Moses show to the members of his people
and through that very appearance he showed[44] them how to be healed.
"Look and be healed!" - this was being proclaimed aloud
and they wondered and marvelled about how an appearance could heal.
They were in a state[45] of doubt initially when considering
until they learned by experience and so too believed.
By experience they acquired understanding to act wisely
and they believed that the dumb one could restrain the venom of the reptile.
In deed they learned of the deed of the cast serpent

---

[35] EFG: "in the midst of".
[36] Nu. 21,8.
[37] Moses, as in Nu. 12,3.
[38] Nu. 21,9.
[39] EFG: "the mute one".
[40] EFG: "harmed".
[41] Nu. 21,8-9.
[42] For the place where Moses erected the serpent, cf. Maneschg, "Schlange", p. 441-451, who notes that according to both Justin (PG 6, 417-420) and Severian of Gabala (PG 56, 503), Moses hung the snake near the tabernacle.
[43] Theod. b. Koni, p. 167,10 asks why Moses hung (*zqp*) a brazen serpent and answers, p. 168,8-9, that relief came through the wood and nothing else, just as life is through the cross and nothing else. Cf. Maneschg, "Schlange", p. 441-451.
[44] EG: "taught".
[45] Corr.

and they began to trample upon the serpents through the force which came from it.
They saw that its appearance was quieting the war of their afflictions
and they despised and mocked the war instruments of those who harmed them.[46]
Like nothing the bitter bites became
for the serpent, through its appearance, was tempering the venom in them.
Once a living serpent had bitten a living person
he would look at the lifeless one and its venom receded from his members.
Once the fierce ones were provoked to wrath ferociously
the quiet appearance which was without life force quieted[47] them.
They became weary and were enfeebled from shedding the venom which was in them
for while bitter, its bitterness was not felt.
No matter how much they bitterly bit
it was, as it were, no venom to the senses of the body.
As long as the eye of man was fixed upon the lifeless one
the venom of the living ones didn't even seem to be.
In steadfastness the eye was steadily upon its appearance
and it was not sated in considering its muteness.
Hail mute one which amazed and stilled rational beings
and attracted their glance towards the Force which was hidden in its aspect.
Hail non-living one which is entirely bereft of life force
for it revived man from the deadliness of the venom of reptiles.[48]
Hail one without voice or senses which issue voice
for it rebuked the dumb ones and quieted them in their struggle.
Hail one which does not see those who see it, as to whom are they like
for it became an appearance which dispels human suffering and pain.
Hail one which does not discern the force of greatness which was being spoken through it
for it suppressed the venom of undiscerning serpents.
Hail one which does not even know that it is what it is
for it made men know to consider the force of the Creator.
Hail to you, serpent - not you serpent, for you are not even a serpent -
for you were able to become the cause of life for him who looks at you.
Forsooth! did your appearance temper the venom of reptiles
or was it perhaps another appearance which is unseen?
Forsooth! did mercy flow from you to the people

---

[46] EFG: "the various arms of their injuries".
[47] EFG: "cooled them down".
[48] EFG: "passions".

or was it perhaps from Him who created the people and everything?
Forsooth! did the healing which took place[49] through you take place by chance
or was perhaps the symbol of the true physician hidden in you?
Forsooth! how is it that while you are mute you are harsher than living ones
and through what force do you subdue living ones and revive the dead?
Your question is full of question, o serpent which senses not
and a great force is hidden in the aid which flows from you.
The question concerning you called upon me to question your question
and it itself incited me to walk on the words of the path of your story.
Your story troubled me so as to recount your story before listeners
and lo, I am eager to reveal the force hidden in your muteness.
Come, o listeners, question with me the cause which I seek to know
so that once we have come to know, we will properly know to question things which are hidden.
Let us question why the fashioning of the cast serpent came about
and having been fashioned, how and through what did it do that which it did?
By what force did it vanquish the serpents through its appearance
and abate the might of the deadly venom which they were shedding?
How was a lifeless appearance without life force able
to dispel the suffering from ravaged members?
Moreover, how ever could it heal through the eyes alone
while other senses did not benefit from its aid?
Why through a gaze was the mercy in it dispensed
while its very substance did not draw near to the wounds?
If of itself is the force which subdued the serpents
why did those harmed not draw near to it?
If it did not possess force to give life to man
for what altogether was this lifeless appearance without life force?
Of what use was the insensible one to[50] those who sense
and of what benefit the silent brass to those possessing word?
If the nature of mute ones was able to do this
why didn't the holy vessels of the holy place do this?
The books[51] were seemly and the ark too was glorious
and for what reason did no cure come about through their appearance?
Of one of two things does the affair of the cast serpent consist:
either it is something or the symbol of something is hidden in its appearance.
There is some cause for its cause and for its cure

---

[49] EFG: "which flowed".
[50] EFG: "Why was the insensible one needed by".
[51] The books of tablets of the law which were placed in the ark in the Holy of Holies (Ex. 25,16; Heb. 9,4).

and it would seem that it is greater than all causes in the law.
The books were not able to do that which its aspect did
nor sacrifices, burnt offerings or blood of calves.
205 I have seen[52] the deed which took place by means of the insensible one
and[53] it is even more exalted and loftier than Moses who constructed and made it.
How would it not be greater than Moses and than his book too
for it did something which neither Moses nor his law did!
Moses and his book were those harmed considering
210 yet they were not aided against the harm of the serpents.
Awesome was the aspect of the great Moses beyond all things[54]
but to the serpents it was more contemptible and despicable than all things.
Had Moses entirely been laid upon the bites
he would not have caused healing unless one looked at the serpent.
215 The appearance of the dumb one was honored by the vipers
far more than Moses or the Divine law.
It is proper, therefore, to question its cause: what it is and for what
and because of what it was magnified and more honored than Moses.
At the greatness of its rank have I wondered much and do still wonder
220 about how it dispensed life-giving cure while it itself is lifeless.
Its very lifelessness has forced me to say[55] some words about it
and lo, I am in the state of one in childbirth because[56] of its story.
Like a foetus its story constrains the womb of my mind
that it go out and proclaim the meaning[57] hidden within it.
225 The disclosure of the Divine Force is disclosed in it
which is going to bring about something new on earth as It did through it.
It paved the way[58] symbolically through it prior to the reality
so that it would be easy for mankind to go towards their lives.
The life of men was hidden in its appearance and in its cure
230 and it seems[59] that by means of that which is hidden,[60] it[61] is going to shine forth.
Spiritually did cure flow from its silence
and perhaps in this way would it happen to men through a man.
Through a man was God of all going to revive men
and He did it beforehand by means of the serpent which healed men.

---

[52] EFG: "New is".
[53] BCD: "for".
[54] Ex. 34,29-30.
[55] EFG: "conceive".
[56] EFG: "at the time".
[57] The syriac for "meaning" entails disclosure, which recurs in the following stich.
[58] EFG: "The way is paved".
[59] Corr.
[60] EFG: "despicable".
[61] I.e. the life of men.

235 The symbol of Him who is coming did He depict in the appearance of the mute one
so that when He would come, His appearance not be strange to men.
Men were going to wonder at the newness of His force
and He reenforced the serpent that they would not doubt about Him who is coming.
Through its aspect alone did it provide cure to the smitten[62]
240 so that no man question in faith the appearance which is near.
Through faith as well the Hebrews were being healed
and it was not through a medicine either visible or tangible.
Through faith was He going to revive men through a man
and He set the demonstration of His faith in faith.[63]
245 Through the death of a man was He determined to undo death
and He taught man to ask for life from one who is wholly lifeless.
At the top of Golgotha He was going to hang Him atop of wood
and He taught Moses to hang up His symbol in the middle of the people.[64]
At the time when the peoples' iniquity would multiply was He going to show Him
250 and in that very likeness He revealed (His) likeness on account of iniquity.
Because of iniquity the vipers sallied forth against the Hebrews
and for the shedders[65] of iniquity He armed the serpent against the pains.
Through an impassible one He relieved the passible ones from their pains
so that when He would redeem through a passible one, none would find fault.
255 Through a lifeless one which doesn't possess life force He revived the people

---

[62] Theod. b. Koni, p. 167,14-18 says that all who believe in Christ won't perish, for if an insensible one can cure by a glance, how much the more will the cross pardon the world. He adds further on, p. 168,5-8 (parallel to Anon. Com., fol. 88v,10-13) that he who was bitten by a viper couldn't escape death except by looking at the brazen serpent. So too, one who doesn't look at the cross won't be released from demons. Ephrem (Leloir, XVI, §15, p. 176) compares the serpent in Paradise to the serpents in the desert. He adds that "those who look with their eyes at the sign fixed by Moses on the cross will have bodily healing. So too those who look with the eyes of the soul at... Christ... on the cross and believe, will live". In calling that upon which the serpent was hung a "cross", Ephrem goes beyond Theod. b. Koni, see st. 121 above. He further compares the impassible nature of the snake to "He who suffers on the Cross", claiming that the former shows that the latter's nature is immortal. This would clearly be unacceptable to either Theodore or those whom he influenced. For the formulation of Narsai and others see below, st. 385 and the accompanying note.
[63] Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 72) similarly says that "one who is considered mortal will give life to those who believe in Him, through the Force which dwells in Him; and ... he recalled the proof (or demonstration) of the serpent...".
[64] According to Cosmas, V, 111 (Wolska, II, p. 169) the snake respresents the "passion of our Lord".
[65] CEFG: "and for the remission".

so that once He would resurrect the dead through one dead they would not debate about how.
He who would debate did He refute beforehand through that which He did
so that should he debate, he should debate about that which took place (first) and then about this.
He who would doubt did He put to shame beforehand through the cure of the serpent
260 for if a mute one provided cure, how much more one endowed with speech!
He who is contentious did He reprehend through the appearance which dispelled sufferings
for if this happened through brass, how much the more through a man!
Forsooth, o man! why are you amazed at the redemption of man?
for lo, through brass an amazing thing took place which likens this.[66]
265 Forsooth, o circumcized one! why don't you admit the meaning of your symbols
for lo, in you is depicted that which took place among the uncircumcized peoples.
Forsooth! for you it is certain that the serpent healed you gratuitously
yet how is it that you don't accept a man's having revived man?
Forsooth! the appearance of a dumb one redeemed you from the mouth of the dumb ones
270 yet to the redemption through one endowed with speech you do not confess.
Forsooth! and if this is not so, reveal and tell me the cause of the serpent:
what it is and for what and because of what you were healed by it.
If for you it is certain that it healed your pains in the way in which it healed
why do you doubt the healing which is greater than that one?
275 Far greater is the redemption which took place through a man than[67] (through) the serpent
just as the greatness of man is greater than that of animals.
Be silent, therefore, o Israelite blinded by jealousy
and do not deny manifest truth with your denial.
You too be still, o heretic, the other blind one
280 do not disturb the flow of our words with your contention.
To me, the effrontery of your contention equals that of the Jew;

---

[66] Cyrus, p. 106,5-9, answers those who would ask how it is possible that redemption be procured by a man, that the proof is available from many things: the plate, the serpent, the lamb, etc. Similarly p. 110,14-27 where Cyrus adds that God could have lent assistance by a simple word but chose these things in His Economy.

[67] BCD: "than that of".

on account of that have I mingled the name of your evil with (that of) your equal.
One is the confession of your faith and of the Jew
for you have wronged the mystery of the incarnation in his likeness.
285 As for him, he does not accept the redemption of man which took place through a man
and you do not confess that the (Divine) Being redeemed humanity through a man.
Through a man is the humanity of man redeemed, o contentious ones[68]
and Moses attests (to this) for he raised up the serpent as a symbol of your redemption.[69]
"Just as Moses raised up the serpent in the desert,
290 so too the Son of man is going to be exalted."[70]
That very same Commandment which healed the pains of the people through the serpent
also revived man through a man.
That very Will which exalted the dumb one by means of Its aid
also exalted a rational man above all things.
295 As a symbol of the exaltedness which was in the one endowed with speech was the mute one magnified
and through His sovereignty it acquired sovereignty to dispel pain.
For this purpose were both its fashioning and its exaltedness:[71]
that it prepare the way for the exaltation of man which is through a man.
Man did the force of the Creator exalt through a serpent and a man
300 and his sorrow He healed through a dumb one and through one endowed with speech.
Through the serpent He healed manifest pains of the limbs
and through a man, manifest pains and hidden debts.
Through the look of the eyes life-giving[72] cure was dispensed
and redemption of man through faith which is in the mind.
305 Inferior was the force in the mute one to that of the one endowed with speech
in that it couldn't efface debts or even[73] stains.
Bodily injuries alone could it purify
but the debt of debts was too difficult for it to expiate.[74]
(But) a part of man did the insensible healer heal
310 for it was not up to it to perfect man in that it was not a man.

---

[68] BCDEFG: "one".

[69] EFG: "and the serpent which Moses raised up as a symbol of His redemption attests".

[70] EFG: "a man". Jo. 3,14.

[71] EFG "was its fashioning and its exaltedness as well".

[72] EFG: "the cure of the serpent".

[73] EFG: "like".

[74] Cf. Heb. 9,13-14. EFG: "to redeem".

A man was going to perfect man through the force of the Creator
and He prepared his perfection beforehand through that which was inferior to Him.
As a guide He sent the serpent prior to His coming
so that through one who causes harm He would heal the pain of those harmed.
In order to shame the demons did He do this through a serpent and through a man
so that through that with which they harmed man He would revive man.
Through the serpent the head of their ranks caused the head of humanity to err[75]
and through the serpent He healed the pains caused by the serpents.
Them He expelled through the symbol of the cure from the mute one
in order to inform them that the time was near when they would be put to shame.
And probably they were saddened when the serpent dispelled the pain
as they wailed when Christ expelled Legion.[76]
And probably they complained when they saw the cure of the dumb one
like that time when they were incensed against Jesus.[77]
Probably they were thinking in the hateful thought of their minds:
"Forsooth! what is this new thing which has taken place among mortals?
How did it happen that a serpent through which He[78] introduced death
changed and revived the mortality of man through the aspect of its face?"
Mourning they donned before the serpent and our Lord
about how they healed pain and debt without medicines.
Before our Lord were they especially mournful
for body and soul were being healed through the word of His mouth.
At Him and at the serpent did they wonder and marvel
about how much the symbol is like the truth through[79] its deeds.
And if it is so that demons marvelled and were amazed at the truth and at the[80] symbol
let the Jew and the heretic remain outside the door.
Outside the door of faith let the stubborn ones stand
because they do not wish to enter with us in the confession of truth.
Let the symbol and[81] the truth condemn the audacious ones
and shut the door of His truth before them.
Let the serpent in its silence bring charge against their words[82]

---

[75] Gen. 3,1-6.
[76] Mk. 5,5-10; Lk. 8,28-31.
[77] Mt. 16,23.
[78] EFG: "we".
[79] EFG: "through the force of".
[80] EFG: "its".
[81] EFG: "of".

for they do not allow the man who is from us to be exalted.
Forsooth! the serpent which is without life force was magnified and was honored
but the second Adam – why do you preclude Him from exaltedness?
Forsooth! brass which men cast healed men
yet the man whom the force of the Spirit cast, why would He not heal?
Forsooth! ascribe to Him the force to aid[83] as to the serpent
and let Him stay in the rank which He reached along side the Essence.
Greater[84] is His rank than that of the mute one, o sons of contention
and he who belittles the exaltedness[85] of His rank, double is his punishment!
Because of His rank was the lowly one – cast serpent – magnified
and were it not for Him, not even its existence would have been taken into account.
It would have been nothing if something had not been hidden in it
and its cure would not have been believed without something.
That very something about which I have spoken is Christ who is true over[86] all
and as nothing are all things considered in comparison to him.
Nothing is that dumb serpent compared to Him[87]
and Paul testifies to this for he called it the shadow of something.
"The law contains only a shadow[88]
and it was not truth which is in substantial reality."[89]
The body is Christ[90] who is true and perfect in body and soul
and His shadow is the serpent which served as the symbol of His redemption.
As the symbol of His redemption did the mute one serve among the Hebrews
and like a herald its silence proclaimed His coming. [...][91]
and to discerning ones the speech of its muteness was manifest.
Without voice it was conversing with its hearers

---

[82] EFG: "deceit".
[83] EFG: "to heal".
[84] EFG: "More exalted".
[85] EFG: "greatness".
[86] EFG: "who is truer than".
[87] Corr.
[88] Heb. 10,1; Col. 2,16.
[89] Col. 2;17.
[90] Col. 2,17.
[91] One stich is missing and two alternatives are offered: EFG: "Symbolically was it narrating His coming"; BD: "A symbol of His crucifixion did the lifeless one which hung on wood prefigure". The former is preferable because the verb *ṭps* is not familiar to me in Narsai's homilies except for Hom. 35, the authenticity of which is questionable (see study, ch. 1).

and instead of ears, eyes listened to its proclamation.
Hail herald, undiscerning and unendowed with speech
who made heard on earth the new tidings of the renewal of man.
Hail envoy of halting speech and steps
who surpassed those possessing speech in its swiftness.
Hail one through whom the force of the Creator uttered while it did not utter through it
and men listened to it while never having heard[92] its voice.
Hail, how pleasing is your matter, unpleasant serpent
and[93] while you are hateful, through you men have bettered themselves from hateful things
Hail hateful one who made man hateful from the beginning
who turned and made pleasing the pleasantness which it had made hateful[94] in the place of Eden.
Hateful are you o serpent, and especially you of brass
and the goodness which is from you is not your own but from the Benevolent One.
The Benevolent One in His love made you a vision of loveliness
in order to reproach through you the Adversary who made man hateful through you.
Therefore, not you does he who praises you praise
but rather the Force which shows Its force even through feeble ones.
The Force of the Creator revived[95] the people through the mute symbol
and It also revived the dead peoples through the living truth.[96]
In truth let us confess that His Force has done that and this;
to[97] Him belong the former and the latter things.
Blessed is He who through His crucifixion paved the way for us to the kingdom on high
and through it redeemed us from the servitude of evil and death.[98]

---

[92] Corr.

[93] EFG: "for".

[94] EFG: "which he had procured".

[95] EFG: "reenforced".

[96] Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 72-73) says that "just as the snake which possesses no life releases, through the force of another, those who were perishing from the snake bites if they looked at it, so the one considered mortal and passible prepares life for those who believe in him through the Force which dwells in him". So too Theod. b. Koni, p. 167,21-24 and Išo'dad (Gibson, III, p. 130,20-131,4).

[97] EFG: "and to".

[98] EFG present an alternate reading for st. 388-389: "The End. Let us praise with all mouths, the Benevolent One whose goodnesses are loftier than our force".

ܟܠ ܡܢܗ̈ܝ ܘܟܠ ܕܡܢܗ̈ܝ

The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy

An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai

Part 3. Study

Preface

Narsai is celebrated as the Harp of the Spirit yet of the three hundred and sixty homilies attributed to him by the various sources, only about eighty have been preserved. The largest edition to date is that of Mingana (Mosul, 1905) containing forty seven homilies. It is upon this uncritical edition that all translations and studies were based until 1968. In that year Gignoux published a critical edition of Narsai's six homilies on creation. He was followed by McLeod in 1979 who presented a critical edition and translation of five soteriological homilies which had never been edited. Narsai's fame as a poet and exegete is sufficient justification for further publication of his work, which remains far too neglected. Two factors have motivated the selection of the homilies presented in this dissertation: the importance of editing and translating hitherto unpublished and thus inaccessible texts and an interest in the history of East-Syrian Old Testament exegesis. A survey of Narsai's extant works has indicated that six homilies on the Pentateuch satisfy the established criteria. These are Homily I "On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah", Homily II "On the Flood", Homily III "On the Blessings which Noah Gave His Sons", Homily IV "On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues", Homily V "On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle" and Homily VI "On the Brazen Serpent".

Any exegetical study is abetted by a reliable text edition and for this reason Part 1 of this dissertation consists of a critical text edition of the six aforesaid homilies based on the available manuscripts. The edition is complemented by a translation in Part 2. The notes accompanying the text of the translation indicate corrections, biblical references and parallels in other homilies by Narsai. Additionally, comparisons are made with the works of Ephrem, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eusebius of Emesa, Cosmas Indicopleustes, Cyrus of Edessa, the Anonymous Commentary of ms. (olim) Diyarbakır 22, Theodore bar Koni, Išoʿ bar Nun, Išoʿdad of Merv and the Anonymous Commentary (ms. Mingana Syriac 553). The similarities and differences which are highlighted will hopefully assist in determining the nature and origins of Narsai's exegesis and its place in the East-Syrian tradition.

Part 3 consists of a reconstruction of Narsai's views as these emerge from the study of the six Old Testament homilies. While these six do not form a continuous commentary on any one book of the bible, they supplement each other and inform us of Narsai's views on the position occupied by Old

Testament events within the history of salvaton. A study of the homilies is preceded by an overview of Narsai's life and works in Chapter One.

Chapter Two contains a general survey of Narsai's view on the Divine Economy. This presentation will serve as the starting-point for the detailed analyses in the chapters which follow. Of special interest is the question of the origins of Narsai's thoughts, especially his dependence on Theodore of Mopsuestia on the one hand and Ephrem the Syrian on the other.

The line set out in Chapter Two whereby an attempt is made to establish Narsai's relationship to both Ephrem and the Antiochene tradition, is continued in Chapters Three through Six. Narsai's ideas are juxtaposed to those of Theodore and Ephrem. In addition, a comparison is made with the homilies of Jacob of Sarug, Narsai's rival and opponent. Jacob's works help clarify the points of dissension in the 5th c. theological debates and underline the choices made by Narsai. Comparison with the East-Syrian exegetes then follows. There where Theodore's texts have been lost to posterity, the works of later East-Syrian exegetes may help illuminate the nature of Nasai's relationship to the Interpreter. The East-Syrian exegetes, however, are no mere substitute for Theodore. They represent the transmission of various traditions which include Ephrem's works, Theodore's commentaries and the "tradition of the school". It is the concern of this study to determine the degree to which these nearly contemporary and later works are similar to Narsai's as well as to trace the fate of Narsai's works. This naturally leads to the problem of the nature of the "tradition of the school" which is said to have been transmitted in Narsai's homilies. Thus the works of Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa are considered first, after a comparison between Narsai, Theodore, Ephrem and Jacob of Sarug. Although Cosmas lived and wrote in Alexandria, he himself claims to have been taught by Mar Abā, a 6th c. East-Syrian teacher. Moreover, Wolska, in her study of Cosmas's *Christian Topography*, has brought to light the many correspondences between Cosmas and Theodore. These two facts are reason enough to include Cosmas in this study. For the sake of convenience, he has been included in the sections on East-Syrian exegesis in Chapters Three through Six.

Chapter Three commences with a review of the Divine Economy from the creation through the fall, arriving at the status of man until the translation of Enoch (Homily I). His translation does not stand on its own but is linked to the translation of Elijah and the ascension of Christ. Thus the Old Testament events are placed in the larger context of the progression of history through the Old and New Testaments, from the temporal world to that of the future.

Chapter Four treats three homilies together, those dealing with the history of the ten generations from Noah until Abraham (Homilies II-IV). In these homilies Narsai follows the account of Gen. 6–11, stressing certain elements so that the history of mankind is seen to conform to specific patterns. The question of man's moral potential is raised in this chapter, in view of the increase of sin from one generation to the next. Connected to this is the question of God's expectations and plans for men and the way He interacts with them.

Chapter Five deals not with Genesis but with two seemingly disparate subjects: the fashioning of the tabernacle (Hom. V) and the brazen serpent (Hom. VI). These two homilies are closely related, however, in that they both are concerned with foreshadowing and types. The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia maintained a highly developed theory on types makes these homilies particularly interesting for a study of his importance for Narsai.

Conclusions concerning the questions raised are presented in the sixth and final chapter.

Bibliography[1]

I. *Works of Narsai*

I.a Manuscripts

Birmingham, Selly Oak Colleges Library, Mingana Syriac 55
(Olim) Diyarbakır, Chaldean Archbishopric, 71
Leningrad (St. Petersburg), The Institute of the Peoples of Asia, MS Diettrich 5
London, British Library, Oriental 5463
London, British Library, Oriental 9363c
London, British Library, Oriental 9367
Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 588
Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican Syriac 594
Teheran, Neesan 1

I.b Text Editions

Feldmann, F., *Syrische Wechsellieder von Narses*, Leipzig, 1896.

Gignoux, Ph., *Homélies de Narsaï sur la Création* (PO XXXIV,3–4), Turnhout, 1968. Quoted by homily and stich unless otherwise indicated.

McLeod, F., *Narsai's Metrical Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension* (PO XL,1), Turnhout, 1979. Quoted by homily and stich unless otherwise indicated.

Martin, F., "Homélie de Narsès sur les trois Docteurs nestoriens", in *Journal Asiatique* 14 (1899), 446–492; 15 (1900), 469–525.

Mingana, A., *Narsai doctoris syri Homiliae et carmina*, 2 vol., Mosul, 1905.

Pataq Siman, E., *Narsaï. Cinq homélies sur les paraboles évangéliques*, Paris, 1984.

Wolff, M., "Drei Begräbnisgesänge Narsais", in *Oriens Christianus* 12–14 (1925), 1–29.

I.c Translations

Allgeier, A., "Ein syrischer Memra über die Kirche als die Braut Christi", in *Der Katholik* (1917) 151–163.

---

[1] This bibliography lists only those manuscripts and works consulted and referred to in this thesis.

Allgeier, A., "Ein syrischer Memra über die Seele in religionsgeschichtlichem Rahmen", in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 21 (1922), 360–396.

Brouwers, P., "Premier poème de Narsaï sur le baptême", in *Mélanges de L'Université Saint-Joseph* 41 (1965), 179–207.

Connolly, R., *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* (Texts and Studies, 8), Cambridge, 1909.

Delly, E., "Le 23e memra de Narsaï", in *Divinitas* 3 (1959), 514–553.

Gignoux, Ph., "Homélie de Narsaï sur la création d'Adam et d'Ève et sur la transgression du commandement", in *L'Orient Syrien* 7 (1962), 307–336.

Gignoux, Ph., "Homélie de Narsaï sur la création du monde", in *L'Orient Syrien* 7 (1962), 477–506.

Gignoux, Ph., "Homélie de Narsaï sur le mot «au commencement» et sur l'Essence divine", in *L'Orient Syrien* 8 (1963), 227–250.

Gignoux, Ph., "Sur les mystères de L'Église et sur le baptême", in A. Hamman, ed., *L'initiation chrétienne* (Les Pères dans la foi, 17), Paris, 1980, 195–213. This homily was published earlier as "Homélies sur le baptême et sur l'eucharistie", in *L'initiation chrétienne* (Lettres chrétiennes, 7), Paris (1963), 195–213.

Gignoux, Ph., "Sur l'exposition des mystères", in A. Hamman, ed., *L'Initiation chrétienne* (Les Pères dans la foi, 17), Paris, 1980, 214–247. This homily was published earlier as "Homélies sur le baptême et sur l'eucharistie", in *L'initiation chrétienne* (Lettres chrétiennes, 7), Paris (1963), 214–247.

Guillaumont, A., "Poème de Narsaï sur le baptême", in *L'Orient Syrien* 1 (1956), 189–207.

Krüger, P., "Das älteste syrisch-nestorianische Dokument über die Engel", in *Ostkirchliche Studien* 1 (1952), 283–296.

Krüger, P., "Traduction et commentaire de l'homélie de Narsaï sur les martyrs dans le nestorianisme primitif", in *L'Orient Syrien* 3 (1958), 299–318.

Krüger, P., "Ein Missionsdokument aus frühchristlicher Zeit: Deutung und Übersetzung des «Sermo de memoria Petri et Pauli» des Narsai", in *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 42 (1958), 271–291.

Krüger, P., "Le sommeil des âmes dans l'œuvre de Narsaï", in *L'Orient Syrien* 4 (1959), 193–210.

II. *General Bibliography*

AC, see Anonymous Commentary.

Albert, M., *Homélies contre les Juifs par Jacques de Saroug* (PO XXXVIIII,1), Turnhout, 1976.

Alexandre, M., "L'épée de flamme (Gen 3,24): Textes chrétiens et traditions juives", in A. Caquot, et. al., ed., *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommages à V. Nikiprowetzky*, Louvain - Paris, 1986, 403–441.

Alwan, Kh., *Jacques de Saroug. Quatre Homélies métriques sur la Création* (CSCO 508–509/Syr. 214–215), Louvain, 1989. Quoted by homily and stich unless otherwise indicated.

Anderson, G.A., "The Cosmic Mountain. Eden and Its Early Interpreters in Syriac Christianity", in G.A. Robbins, ed., *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis. Intrigue in the Garden* (Studies in Women and Religion, 28), 187–224, Lewiston, New York, 1988.

Anon. Com., see Anonymous Commentary.

Anonymous Commentary = Birmingham, Selly Oak, Ms. Mingana Syriac 553.

Aphrahat, see Parisot, I.

Aptowitzer, V., *Kain und Abel in der Agada*, Vienna - Leipzig, 1922.

Assemani, J.S., *Epistola Symeonis Beth-Arsamensis de Barsauma episcopo Nisibeno, deque hæresi Nestorianorum* (Bibliotheca Orientalis, I), Rome, 1719.

Assemani, J.S., *Ebedjesu. Enumeratio librorum omnium ecclesiasticorum* (Bibliotheca Orientalis, III), Rome, 1725.

Baumstark, A., *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluss der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*, Bonn, 1922.

Beck, E., "Das Bild vom Spiegel bei Ephräm", in *Oriens Christianus Periodica* 19 (1953), 5–24.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Fide* (CSCO 154–155/Syr. 73–74), Louvain, 1955.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen Contra Haereses* (CSCO 169–170/Syr. 76–77), Louvain, 1957.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Paradiso und Contra Julianum* (CSCO 174–175/Syr. 78–79), Louvain, 1957.

Beck, E. "Symbolum-Mysterium bei Aphraat und Ephräm", in *Oriens Christianus* 41 (1958), 19–40.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Nativitate* (CSCO 186–187/Syr. 82–83), Louvain, 1959.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Ecclesia* (CSCO 198–199/Syr. 84–85), Louvain, 1960.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Virginitate* (CSCO 223–224/Syr. 94–95), Louvain, 1962.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Carmina Nisibena* (CSCO 218–219/Syr. 92–93 and 240–241/Syr. 102–103), Louvain, 1961–1963.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Paschahymnen (De Azymis, De Crucifixione, De Resurrectione)* (CSCO 248–249/Syr. 108–109), Louvain, 1964.

Beck, E., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Ieiunio* (CSCO 246–247/Syr. 106–107), Louvain, 1964.

Beck, E., "Ephraems Brief an Hypatios", in *Oriens Christianus* 58 (1974), 76–120.

Beck, E., "Das Bild vom Weg mit Meilensteinen und Herbergen bei Ephräm", in *Oriens Christianus* 65 (1981), 1–39.

Beck, E., "Zur, Terminologie von Ephräms Bildtheologie", in M. Schmidt and C. Geyer, eds., *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern*, Eichstätt, 1981, 239–277.

Bedjan, P., *Liber Superiorum seu Historia monastica auctore Thoma Episcopo Margensi*, Paris - Leipzig, 1901.

Bedjan, P., *Homiliae Selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis*, 5 vol., Paris–Leipzig, 1905–1910.

Bedjan, P., *Mar Isaacus Ninivita, De Perfectione Religiosa*, Paris, 1909.

Berlin, A., *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, Bloomington, 1985.

La Bible d'Alexandrie. 2. L'Exode. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes by A. Le Boulluec and P. Sandevoir, Paris, 1989.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., Stuttgart, 1967–1977.

Biblia Sacra juxta versionem simplicem quae dicitur Pschitta, 3 vol., Beirut, 1951 (= Mosul edition).

Blum, J., "Zum Bau von Abschnitten in Memre von Jacob von Sarug", in R. Lavenant, ed., *III. Symposium Syriacum 1980* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 221), Rome, 1983, 308–321.

Bou Mansour, T., "Aspects de la liberté humaine chez Saint Éphrem le Syrien", in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 60 (1984), 252–282.

Bou Mansour, T. "Étude de la terminologie symbolique chez Saint Éphrem", in *Parole de l'Orient* 14 (1987), 221–262.

Brock, S.P., "A Syriac Life of Abel", in *Le Muséon* 87 (1974), 467–492.

Brock, S.P., "Genesis 22 in Syriac Tradition", in P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker, eds., *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 38), Fribourg - Göttingen, 1981, 2–30.

Brock, S.P., *Soghyātā Mgabbyāthā*, Glane (Monastery of St. Ephrem), 1982.

Brock, S.P., "A Dispute of the Months and Some Related Syriac Texts", in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 30 (1985), 181–211.

Brock, S.P., "Isaac of Nineveh: Some Newly Discovered Works", in *Sobornost* 8 (1986), 28–33.

Brock, S.P., "Two Syriac Verse Homilies on the Binding of Isaac", in *Le Muséon* 99 (1986) 61–129.

Brock, S.P., "The Published Verse Homilies of Isaac of Antioch, Jacob of Serugh, and Narsai: Index of Incipits", in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 32 (1987), 279–313.

Brock, S.P., "Diachronic Aspects of Syriac Word Formation: An Aid for Dating Anonymous Texts", in R. Lavenant, ed., *V. Symposium Syriacum 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236), Rome, 1990, 321–330.

Brock, S.P., *St. Ephrem the Syrian. Hymns on Paradise*, Crestwood, New York, 1990.

Brock, S.P., "Syriac Dispute Poems: The Various Types", in G.J. Reinink and H.L.J. Vanstiphout, eds., *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East. Forms and Types of Literary Debates in Semitic and Related Literatures*, Louvain, 1991.

Bultmann, R., *Die Exegese des Theodor von Mopsuestia. Posthum herausgegeben von Helmut Feld und Karl Hermann Schelkle*, Stuttgart, 1984.

Clarke, E.G., see Išoʻ bar Nun.

Cosmas, see Cosmas Indicopleustes.

Cosmas Indicopleustes = Wolska-Conus, W., *Cosmas Indocopleustès. Topographie chrétienne* (Sources chrétiennes 141, 159, 197), Paris, 1968–1973.

CSCG = *Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca*, Turnhout - Louvain, 1977 ss.

CSCO = *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, editum consilio Universitatis catholicae Americae et Universitatis catholicae Lovaniensis*, Paris - Louvain, 1903 ss.

Cyrus, see Cyrus of Edessa.

Cyrus of Edessa = Macomber, W.F., *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa* (CSCO 355–356/Syr. 155–156), Louvain, 1974.

Dadišoʻ Qaṭrāyā, see Draguet, R.

Devreesse, R., *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi, 141), Vatican City, 1959.

Devreesse, R., see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Dewart, J., *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, no. 16), Washington, D.C., 1971.

Diyarb., see Diyarbakır 22.

Diyarbakır 22 = Van Rompay, L., *Le Commentaire sur Genèse–Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbakır 22* (CSCO 483–484/Syr. 205–206), Louvain, 1986.

Draguet, R., *Commentaire du Livre d'Abba Isaïe (Logoi I–XV) par Dadišoʻ Qaṭrāyā (VIIe s.)* (CSCO 326–327/Syr. 144–145), Louvain, 1972.

Ephrem (Leloir) = Leloir, L., *Saint Ephrem. Commentaire de l'Evangile Concordant. Texte Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709). Folios Additionels* (Chester Beatty Monographs, 8), Louvain - Paris, 1990.

Ephrem (Tonneau) = Tonneau, R.-M., *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii* (CSCO 152–153/Syr. 71–72), Louvain, 1955.

Ephrem, see Beck, E.; Brock, S.P.; Mariès-Mercier.

Eusebius, see Eusebius of Emesa.

Eusebius of Emesa = Hovhannessian, V., *Eusèbe d'Émèse*, I. *Commentaire de l'Octateuque* (Bibliothèque de l'Académie Arménienne de Saint Lazare), Venice, 1980.

Fraade, S.D., *Enosh and His Generation. Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Society of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, 30), Chico, California, 1984.

Frishman, J., "Narsai's Homily for the Palm Festival - Against the Jews: For the Palm Festival or against the Jews?", in H.J.W. Drijvers, R. Lavenant, C. Molenberg, G.J. Reinink, eds., *IV. Symposium Syriacum 1984* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229), Rome, 1987, 217–229.

Frishman, J., "Type and Reality in the Exegetical Homilies of Mar Narsai", in E.A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* XX (Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987), Louvain, 1989, 169–175.

Frishman, J., "The Style and Composition of Narsai's Homily 76 «On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah»", in R. Lavenant, ed., *V. Symposium Syriacum 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236), Rome, 1990, 285–297.

Gafni, I., "Nestorian Literature as a Source for the History of the Babylonian Yeshivot", in *Tarbiz* 51 (1981–1982), 567–576 (hebrew).

Gero, S., *Barṣauma of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the Fifth Century* (CSCO 426/Subs. 63), Louvain, 1981.

Gibson, M.D., see Išoʿdad of Merv.

Gignoux, Ph., "Les doctrines eschatologiques de Narsaï", in *L'Orient Syrien* 11 (1966), 321–353, 461–488; 12 (1967), 23–54.

Gismondi, H., ed., *Mari, Amri et Sliba. De patriarchis nestorianorum*, Rome, 1899.

Greer, R.A., *The Captain of Our Salvation. A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese, 15), Tübingen, 1973.

Guinot, J.N., "La typologie comme technique herméneutique", in *Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères* (Cahiers de Biblica Patristica, 2), Strasbourg, 1989, 1–34.

Hespel-Draguet, see Theodore bar Koni.

Hainthaler, T. and A. Grillmeier, "Cosmas Indicopleustes" in A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche.* Band 2/4. *Die Kirche von Alexandrien mit Nubien und Äthiopien nach 451*, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1990, 150–165.

Hidal, S., *Interpretatio Syriaca. Die Kommentare des Heiligen Ephräm des Syrers zu Genesis und Exodus mit besondere Berücksichtigung ihrer auslegungsgeschichtlichen Stellung* (Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, 6), Lund, 1974.

Hovhannessian, V., see Eusebius of Emesa.

Ibrahim, I., *La doctrine christologique de Narsaï*, Rome, 1974–1975.

Išoʿ b. Nun, see Išoʿ bar Nun.

Išoʿ bar Nun = Clarke, E.G., *The Selected Questions of Ishō bar Nūn on the Pentateuch. Edited and Translated from Ms Cambridge Add. 2017. With a Study of the Relationship of Ishōʿdādh of Merv, Theodore bar Kōnī and Ishō bar Nūn on Genesis* (Studia Post–Biblica, 5) Leiden, 1962.

Išoʿdad, see Išoʿdad of Merv.

Išoʿdad of Merv = Vosté, J.–M and C. Van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Išoʿdad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament*, I. Genèse (CSCO 126 / Syr. 67), Louvain, 1950 (ed.). Van den Eynde, C., *Commentaire d'Išoʿdad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament*, I. *Genèse* (CSCO 156/Syr. 75), Louvain, 1955 (transl.); II. *Exode – Deutéronome* (CSCO 176/Syr. 80 and 179/Syr. 81), Louvain, 1958; III. *Livre des Sessions* (CSCO 229–230/Syr. 96–97), Louvain, 1963; IV. *Isaïe et les Douze* (CSCO 303–304/Syr. 128–129), Louvain, 1969; V. *Jérémie, Ézéchiel, Daniel* (CSCO 328–329/Syr. 146–147), Louvain, 1972; VI. *Psaumes* (CSCO 433–434/Syr. 185–186), Louvain, 1981. All references are to I (text) unless otherwise indicated.

Išoʿdad of Merv (Gibson, *Išoʿdad*) = Gibson, M.D., *The Commentaries of Ishodad of Merv, Bishop of Ḥadatha (c. 850 A.D.)* (Horae Semiticae, 5,6,7,10,11), Cambridge, 1911–1916.

Jacob of Sarug, see Albert, M.; Alwan, Kh.; Bedjan, P.

Jammo, S.Y.H., *La structure de la messe chaldéenne du Début jusqu'à l'Anaphore. Étude historique* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 207), Rome, 1979.

Jansma, T., "Investigations into the Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis. An Approach to the Exegesis of the Nestorian Church and to the Comparison of Nestorian and Jewish Exegesis", in *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 12 (1958), 69–181.

Jansma, T., "L'Hexaméron de Jacques de Sarûg", in *L'Orient Syrien* 4 (1959), 3–42, 129–162, 253–284.

Jansma, T., "The Credo of Jacob of Sĕrūgh: A Return to Nicea and Constantinople", in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 44 (1960), 18–36.

Jansma, T., "Encore le Credo de Jacques de Saroug", in *L'Orient Syrien* 10 (1965), 75–88, 193–236, 331–370, 475–510.

Jansma, T., "Die Christologie Jakobs von Serugh und ihre Abhängigkeit von der alexandrinischen Theologie und der Frömmigkeit Ephraems des Syrers", in *Le Muséon* 78 (1965), 5–46.

Jansma, T., "Études sur la pensée de Narsaï. L'homélie no XXXIV: essai d'interprétation", in *L'Orient Syrien* 11 (1966), 147–168, 265–290, 393–429.

Jansma, T., "Narsai's Homilies on Creation: Remarks on a Recent Edition", in *Le Muséon* 83 (1970), 209–236.

Jansma, T., "Narsai's Dubbele Erfenis. Enkele opmerkingen over de invloed van Theodorus van Mopsueste en van Efraïm de Syriër", in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 51 (1970), 1–15.

Jansma, T., "Narsai and Ephraem. Some Observations on Narsai's Homilies on Creation and Ephraem's Hymns on Faith", in *Parole de l'Orient* 1 (1970), 49–68.

Jansma, T., "Barhebraeus' Scholion on the Words «Let There be Light» (Gen. 1,3) as Presented in His «Storehouse of Mysteries». Some Observations on the Vicissitudes of the Exposition of a Biblical Passage", in *Abr-Nahrain* 12 (1972), 100–114.

Jansma, T., "Beiträge zur Berichtigung einzelner Stellen in Ephraems Genesiskommentar", in *Oriens Christianus* 56 (1972), 50–79.

Jansma, T., "Ephraem on Exodus II,5: Reflections on the Interplay of Human Freewill and Divine Providence", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 39 (1973), 5–28.

Jansma, T., see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Kihn, H., *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg, 1880.

Kowalski, A., *Perfezione e Giustizia di Adamo nel Liber Graduum* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 232), Rome, 1989.

Kronholm, T., *Motifs from Genesis 1-11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian. With Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Tradition* (Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, 11), Lund, 1978.

Le Boulluec-Sandevoir, see *(La) Bible d'Alexandrie.*

LXX, see Septuagint.

Macina, R., "L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: Profil herméneutique, théologique et kérygmatique du mouvement scoliaste nestorien. Monographie programmatique", in *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 32 (1982), 86-124, 263-301; 33 (1983), 39-103.

Macomber, W.F., "The Manuscripts of the Metrical Homilies of Narsai", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 39 (1973), 275-306.

Macomber, W.F., "The Theological Synthesis of Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid Sixth Century", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30 (1964), 5-38, 336-384.

Macomber, W.F., see Cyrus of Edessa.

Maneschg, H., *Die Erzählung von der ehernen Schlange. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Europäischen Hochschulschriften, Reihe 23. Theologie, Band 157), Frankfurt am Main - Bern, 1981.

Margoliouth, G., *Descriptive List of Syriac and Karshuni MSS in the British Museum Acquired Since 1873*, London, 1899.

Mariès, L. and Mercier, Ch., *Hymnes de Saint Ephrem conservées en version arménienne. Texte arménien, traduction et notes explicatives* (PO XXX,1), Paris, 1961.

Martikainen, J., *Das Böse und der Teufel in der Theologie Ephraems des Syrers. Eine systematisch-theologische Untersuchung* (Meddelanden från Stiftelsen för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut, nr 32), Åbo, 1978.

Martikainen, J., *Gerechtigkeit und Güte Gottes. Studien zur Theologie von Ephraem den Syrer und Philoxenos von Mabbug* (Göttinger Orientforschungen I. Reihe Syriaca, band 20), Göttingen, 1981.

Masoretic text, see *Biblia Hebraica.*

McLeod, F., "Man as the Image of God: Its Meaning and Theological Significance in Narsai", in *Theological Studies* 42 (1981), 458-468.

McLeod, F., *The Soteriology of Narsai*, Rome, 1968.

McVey, K., "The Memra of Narsai on the Three Nestorian Doctors as an Example of Forensic Rhetoric", in R. Lavenant, ed., *III. Symposium Syriacum 1980* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 221), Rome, 1983, 87-96.

Mingana, A., ed., *Mešiḥazeka. Histoire de l'église d'Adiabène sous les Parthes et les Sassanides* (Sources Syriaques, 1), Mosul, 1907.

Mingana, A., *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, vol. 1. *Syriac and Garshūni Manuscripts*, Cambridge, 1933.

Molenberg, C., *The Interpreter Interpreted. Išo' bar Nun's Selected Questions on the Old Testament*, Groningen, 1990.

Montgomery, J.A., "Notes on Two Syriac MSS", in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 39 (1920), 113-117.

MT, see Masoretic Text.

Murray, R., *Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition*, Cambridge, 1975.

Murray, R. "The Theory of Symbolism in St. Ephrem's Theology", in *Parole de l'Orient* 6/7 (1975/1976), 1-20.

Murray, R., "Some Rhetorical Patterns in Early Syriac Literature", in *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus. Studies in Early Christian Literature and Its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East*, Chicago, 1977, 109-131.

Murray, R., "Some Themes and Problems of Early Syriac Angelology", in R. Lavenant, ed., *V. Symposium Syriacum 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236), Rome, 1990, 143-153.

Nau, F., *La seconde partie de L'Histoire de Barḥadbšabba 'Arbaïa et Controverse de Theodore avec les Macédoniens* (PO IX,5), Paris, 1913.

Nau, F., see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

The New English Bible, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, Oxford, 1970.

Norris, R.A., *Manhood and Christ. A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Oxford, 1963.

The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version, I.1. *Genesis* (Based on Material collected and studied by T. Jansma, prepared by the Peshitta Institute) - *Exodus* (prepared by M.D. Koster), Leiden, 1977.

Parisot, I., *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes* (Patrologia Syriaca, I-II), 2 vol., Paris, 1894, 1907. Referred to by column.

Pesh., see Peshitta.

Peshitta, see *Biblia Sacra* and *(The) Old Testament.*

Petit, *Coislin.* = Petit, F., *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, II. *Collectio Coisliniana in Genesim* (CCSG 15), Turnhout - Louvain, 1986.

Petit, *Chaîne* = Petit, F., *La Chaîne sur la Genèse. Édition intégrale*, I . *Chapitres 1 à 3* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca, 1), Louvain, 1991.

Petit, F., see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

PG = J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia cursus completus*, series graeca, Paris 1857-1866.

Pigulevskaya, N.V., *Katalog sirijskikh rukopisej Leningrada* (Palestinskij Sbornik 6 (69), Moscow/Leningrad, 1960.

PO = R. Graffin, F. Nau, and F. Graffin, eds., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Paris - Turnhout, 1903ss.

Reed, G.S., *La mission de l'archevêque de Cantorbéry auprès des assyriens* (VIe Cahier d'Etudes Chrétiennes Orientales), s.l., 1968.

Reinink, G.J., *Studien zur Quellen- und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangelienkommentars der Gannat Bussame* (CSCO 414/Subs. 57), Louvain, 1979.

Reinink, G.J., *Gannat Bussame*, I. *Die Adventssonntage* (CSCO 501-502/Syr. 211-212), Louvain, 1988.

Rilliet, F., *Jacques de Saroug. Six Homélies festales en prose* (PO XLIII), Turnhout, 1986.

Rodrigues Pereira, A.S., "Two Syriac Verse Homilies on Joseph", in *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 31 (1989–1990), 95–120.

Sachau, E., see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Scher, A., ed. and transl., *Histoire nestorienne (Chronique de Séert)*, part 2, I (PO VII), Paris, 1911.

Scher, A., *Mar Barḥadbšabba 'Arbaya, évêque de Ḥalwan (VI siècle). Cause de la fondation des Écoles* (PO IV,4), Paris, 1907.

Scher, A., see Theodore bar Koni.

Septuagint, see *Septuaginta*.

Septuaginta, A. Rahlfs, ed., 2 vol., 8th ed., Stuttgart, 1935.

Staab, K., *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 15), Münster i. W., 1933.

Ten Napel, E., "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Mêmrê des Emmanuel bar Shahhare", in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Suppl. 4, Wiesbaden, 1980, 167-169.

Ten Napel, E., "Concepts of Paradise in the Seventh Mêmrâ of the Hexaemeron by Emmanuel bar Shahhare", in E.A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* XVII (Proceedings of the 8th International Patristics Conference held in Oxford, 1979), Oxford, 1982, 1381-1397.

Theodore, see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Theod. b. Koni, see Theodore bar Koni.

Theodore bar Koni = Scher, A., *Theodorus bar Koni. Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO 55/Syr. 19 and 69/Syr. 26), 1910-1912. Hespel, R. and Draguet, R., transl., *Théodore bar Koni, Livre des Scolies (recension de Séert)*, (CSCO 431-432/Syr. 187-188), Louvain, 1981-1982.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Devreesse, *Comm. Psalm.*) = Devreesse, R., *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I-LXXX)* (Studi e Testi, 93), Vatican City, 1939.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Devreesse, *Essai*), see Devreesse, R.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Jansma) = Jansma, T., "Théodore de Mopsueste, Interprétation du Livre de la Genèse. Fragments de la version syriaque (B.M. Add. 17,189, fol. 17-21)", in *Le Muséon* 75 (1962), 63-92.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Nau, *Controverse*) = Nau, F., *Une Controverse avec les Macédoniens* (PO IX,5), Paris, 1913, 633–675.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Petit, *Coislin.*), see Petit, F.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Petit, "L'homme") = Petit, F., "L'homme créé «à l'image» de Dieu. Quelques fragments grecs inédits de Théodore de Mopsueste", in *Le Muséon* 100 (1987), 269–281.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Sachau) = Sachau, E., *Theodori Mopsuesteni Fragmenta Syriaca*, Leipzig, 1869.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*) = Sprenger, H.N., *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, V. Reihe, 1), Wiesbaden, 1977.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Tonneau) = Tonneau, R.-M., "Théodore de Mopsueste, Interprétation (du Livre) de la Genèse (Vat. Syr. 120, ff. I-V)", in *Le Muséon* 66 (1953), 45–64.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*) = Tonneau, R.-M. and Devreesse, R., *Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi, 145) Vatican City, 1949.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Van Rompay, *Psaumes*) = Van Rompay, L., *Théodore de Mopsueste. Fragments syriaques du Commentaire des Psaumes (Psaume 118 et Psaumes 138–148)* (CSCO 435–436/Syr. 189–190), Louvain, 1982.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*) = Vosté, J.-M., *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis Apostoli* (CSCO 115–116/Syr. 62–63), Louvain, 1940.

Theodoret (Fernández Marcos - Sáenz-Badillos) = Fernández Marcos, N. and Sáenz-Badillos, A., *Theodoreti Cyrensus. Quaestiones in Octateuchum* (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros», 17), Madrid, 1979.

Tonneau, R.–M., see Ephrem; Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Tonneau–Devreesse, see Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Van den Eynde, C., see Išo‘dad of Merv.

Van der Horst, P.W., "Nimrod in Early Jewish Haggada" in *idem.*, *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity*, Fribourg - Göttingen, 1990.

Van Rompay, L., "A Hitherto Unknown Nestorian Commentary on Genesis and Exodus 1–9,32 in the Syriac Manuscript (olim) Dijarbekr 22", in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 5 (1974), 53–78.

Van Rompay, L., "Išo‘ bar Nun and Išo‘dad of Merv: New Data for the Study of the Interdependence of their Exegetical Works", in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 8 (1977), 229–249.

Van Rompay, L., "Eznik de Kołb et Théodore de Mopsueste. À propos d'une hypothèse de Louis Mariès", in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 15 (1984), 159–175.

Van Rompay, L., "Quelques remarques sur la tradition syriaque de l'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste", in H.J.W. Drijvers, R. Lavenant, C. Molenberg, G.J. Reinink, eds., *IV. Symposium Syriacum 1984* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229), Rome, 1987, 33–43.

Van Rompay, L., "Gennadius of Constantinople as a Representative of Antiochene Exegesis", in E.A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* XIX (Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987), Louvain, 1989, 400–405.

Van Rompay, L., see Diyarbakır 22; Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Vööbus, A., "Les vestiges d'une lettre de Narsaï", in *L'Orient Syrien* 9 (1964), 515–523.

Vööbus, A., *History of the School of Nisibis* (CSCO 266/Subs. 26), Louvain, 1965.

Vosté, J.-M., see Išo'dad of Merv; Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Wensinck, A.J., *Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XXIII, No 1), Amsterdam, 1923.

Wickert, U., *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Theodors von Mopsuestia* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 27), Berlin, 1962.

Wolska, W., *La «Topographie chrétienne» de Cosmas Indicopleustès. Théologie et science au VI siècle* (Bibliothèque Byzantine, Études, 3), Paris, 1962.

Wolska-Conus, W., see Cosmas Indicopleustes.

Zaharopoulos, D.Z., *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible. A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis*, Mahwah, New Jersey, 1989.

Chapter One

The Life and Works of a Modest and Determined Man

1.1 Narsai's Life

There are few facts concerning Narsai's life which may be stated with certainty. Our two main and earliest sources, Barḥadbšabbā 'Arbāyā[1] and Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān,[2] date to the 6th c. Although both authors were active less than a century after Narsai's death, the stories they recite differ at many points and are perhaps at times closer to fiction than to fact. Apart from these two works, one official document is available, "The Statutes of the School of Nisibis", dated 496 c.e., to which Narsai's name is attached. All other dates have been and continue to be contested by scholars. As no new facts have come to light in recent times, I will limit myself to summarizing the status quaestionis.

All scholars follow Barḥadbšabbā[3] when locating Narsai's birthplace in 'Ain Dulba in the region of Ma'alta in northern Mesopotamia sometime in the first quarter of the 5th c. There he is said to have commenced his schooling at the age of seven. Despite a period of persecution which coincided with his first year as a pupil,[4] the next nine years of Narsai's life seem to have passed uneventfully at the same institution where he excelled in his studies. At the age of sixteen, however, Narsai was orphaned and subsequently entrusted to the guardianship of his uncle Emmanuel, an abbot at the monastery of Kfar Māri, west of the Tigris. There he instructed pupils for a short period before enrolling as a student at the famous school of Edessa. This he did, according to the sources, firstly because his uncle recognized his nephew's talents and stimulated him to go to Edessa with which he himself was familiar and secondly because Narsai himself thirsted for learning.[5] The talents displayed in his youth were further developed, finally leading to such recognition that Narsai was appointed head of the school of Edessa. How many years passed between his arrival in Edessa and his election as director is subject to debate, as is the duration of his directorship prior to his departure for Nisibis. Barḥadbšabbā[6] claims that Narsai was a student at Edessa during two periods of ten years. Each of these intervals was followed by a brief return to Kfar Māri, Narsai having been coerced by his uncle to assume the leadership of the local school. On both occasions he returned to his beloved Edessa as quickly as circumstances allowed.

---

[1] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 588–615.

[2] Scher, *Cause*, p. 319–404.

[3] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 590.

[4] This persecution is likely to have occured under Vahram V (421–438). Cf. Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 58.

[5] On several occasions the sources are ambiguous as to who made the momentous decisions in Narsai's life.

As a student at Edessa in the 5th c., Narsai belonged to the first generation of those who studied the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, which were then in the process of being introduced.[7] He rapidly assimilated the ideas of the Antiochene master[8] and became involved in the escalating christological debates between the Dyophysites, or those who confessed two natures in Christ, and their opponents. This is reflected in Narsai's homilies, a good many of which include diatribes against those who would deny Christ's manhood, e.g. Cyril of Alexandria, Eutyches and their followers.[9] The consequences of these debates were far reaching, for it was at this time that Nestorius was condemned (431) and the Robbers Council convened (449), resulting in the deposition of the pro-Dyophysite Bishop Hiba (who occupied the seat from 435–457) for a period of two years (449–451). The exact role Narsai played in these events is unknown, but the absence of his name from the list of Hiba's supporters drawn up at the Council has led some scholars to conclude that Narsai was not yet head of the school.[10] However, Narsai was not to escape condemnation a second time. Despite Barḥadbšabba's claim that Narsai was unanimously elected director of the school,[11] our author defends himself in one of his own homilies, saying that he was not trying to usurp the office of Rabban.[12] His leadership, commencing shortly after his return to Edessa, is said to have lasted twenty years.[13] It came to an abrupt end when he was expelled, according to some after

---

[6] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 596–597.

[7] I avoid here a discussion of the date of the translations of Theodore's works and the initiators and executors of the translation project. Cf. Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 14–16 and ch. 2 below.

[8] See below, ch. 2f.

[9] See, for example, McLeod, I, 125–162.

[10] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 63; McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 21.

[11] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 599.

[12] McLeod, V, 165–174. McLeod, p. 20–21 and *Soteriology*, p. 20–21, attempts to date the homilies he edits on the basis of the names of the opponents Narsai rebuffs. The "new scribes of passibility" mentioned in McLeod, V, are likely to refer to Eutyches, says McLeod, and thus the homily would date to the late 440's. The fact that in this same homily Narsai protests that he did not aspire to the office of Rabban, would in turn support Vööbus's argument that Narsai was not elected until 451. I think it far more likely that Vööbus's arguments help date the "Homily on the Ascension" rather than vice versa.

Hiba's death in 457 and according to others by Bishop Qurā (471–498).[14] The final date of expulsion would be 489, when Qurā is said to have closed the school, evicting all of the students and teachers. Vööbus has proposed a date close to 471, arguing that Narsai's departure was instigated by Qurā, was unexpected by him and was not in the company of others but solitary. This is why the sources need to apologize for Narsai[15] whose flight not only put his supporters in an awkward position, but left them feeling betrayed as well.[16] Vööbus's arguments thus far are quite convincing. He procures additional evidence for his theory from what he considers to be a genuine letter preserved by Barḥadbšabbā[17] and written by Narsai at the time of his escape.[18] The literary nature of this epistle, however, in which Old Testament figures serve as examples of those who rightly fled in order to carry on their mission, hardly seems to be the product of one in precipitous flight.[19] Barḥadbšabbā does in fact draw parallels between Narsai's history and that of biblical figures on several occasions, e.g. Narsai's schooling in the mountains is said to resemble the situation in the time of Elijah[20] and the setting up of the school in Nisibis is likened to the spread of the gospel after the seemingly disastrous, yet actually propitious, expulsion from Judea.[21]

From Edessa, Narsai fled to Nisibis where a new school was established. Reports conflict as to the actual initiator of the plans for opening the school. According to both Barḥadbšabbās,[22] Narsai arrived in Nisibis planning to travel eastwards. He was received by envoys of Bishop Barṣauma after the bishop –

---

[13] Scher, *Cause*, p. 383; Nau, *Histoire*, p. 599.

[14] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 600,n.1 and 603,n.1, would prefer to read Nonnus instead of Qurā found in the text (p. 600 and 603) because of a statement in the Chronicle of Mešiḥāzēkā or Arbel – the authenticity and dating of which is much debated – that Narsai was expelled after Hiba's death (Mingana, *L'Eglise d'Adiabène*, XVIII, p. 66). Scher, *Cause*, p. 384,n.3, also seems to favor a date shortly after 457. Šem'on of Bēt Aršām (Assemani, *Epistola Symeonis*, p. 353) tells of an expulsion of the Persians following Hibas's death and the subsequent closing of the school of Edessa by Qurā and Emperor Zeno. According to Mari (Gismondi, *De patriarchis*, p. 44) it was Bishop Qurā who was enraged against Narsai. Vööbus (*Nisibis*, p. 41) chooses 471 as the terminus post quem for an expulsion under Qurā.

[15] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 603–604.

[16] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 43–44.

[17] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 604–605.

[18] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 43; *idem*, "Vestige", esp. p. 519–520.

[19] Gero, *Barṣauma*, p. 61,n.8 also expresses doubt about the genuineness of the letter.

[20] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 595.

[21] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 606–607.

[22] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 605 and Scher, *Cause*, p. 384.

Narsai's former classmate at Edessa – had either been alerted by his clerics or realized himself the importance of the man's presence and then persuaded Narsai to set up a center of learning.[23] The Chronicle of Se'ert, however, has Narsai join an already extant school which was later supported by Barṣauma.[24] Vööbus, attributing greater historicity to the latter account, considers Barṣauma shrewd in lending his support to the school after the success of the enterprise was virtually guaranteed.[25] Gero, in his monograph on Barṣauma, thinks this highly unlikely, characterizing Narsai as "charismatic but an indecisive and in some ways unstable personality".[26] This he adduces from Narsai's unwillingness to become director in Kfar Māri, his reluctance to lead the school of Edessa and his hurried departure from there.[27] Yet the very sources which Gero quotes[28] seem to have presented these stories as an attestation of both Narsai's love of learning and his modesty. Support for this view may perhaps be drawn from the story of the founding of the Yeshiva in Sura. Rav is said to have left Nehardea, reaching Sura with the intention of continuing on to Isfahan. Upon being told that the residents were ignorant of the laws of forbidden and permitted things, he changed his plans and set up a school there.[29] The similarity to our story leads one to suspect that we may be dealing with a literary topos rather than with character critique. [30]

Whoever truly founded the school, it is Narsai's personality which is said to have attracted a large number of students, among whom were surely those who left Edessa after the dismantling of the school. Yet even in Nisibis Narsai was not to find true repose. Barṣauma's wife Mamai, roused to jealousy, negatively influenced her husband's congenial feelings towards Narsai. The latter once more

---

[23] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 605-606; Scher, *Cause*, p. 384-386. According to the first source, the clerics alerted Barṣauma whereas the second states that it was Barṣauma himself who quickly evaluated the situation and took action.

[24] Scher, *Histoire nestorienne*, p. 114.

[25] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 49-50.

[26] Gero, *Barṣauma*, p. 65.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] These are the two Barḥadbšabbās, the very sources which he often questions yet here takes at face value!

[29] Gafni, "Babylonian Yeshivot", p. 567-576.

[30] It should be noted, moreover, that confusion exists as to who should be credited with taking the initiative not only in the case of the founding of the school but in that of the project of translating Theodore's works as well. There too the sources are divided, Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān (Scher, *Cause*, p. 382) attributing the main role to Qiyorā, director of the school of Edessa, and others, like Šem'on of Bēt Aršām (Assemani, *Epistola Symeonis*, p. 350) attributing the same to Bishop Hiba, formerly a teacher in the same institution. Cf. Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 14-18.

packed his bags and returned to Kfar Māri.[31] The true cause of the discord and the length of Narsai's absence are once more subject to speculation. McLeod[32] suggests that Narsai disagreed with Barṣauma's innovations with regard to celibacy and thus sided with the Catholicos Babowai on this matter. Gero conjectures that Narsai may have been in disagreement with Barṣauma's restrictions on monasticism and furthermore "refused to take sides in the jurisdictional dispute between Aqaq and Barṣauma". He may also have objected to Barṣauma's demand of loyalty to the Persian government.[33] The rupture between the two was, in any event, prior to 496 when the statutes of the school of Nisibis were formulated. I think it likely that the closing of the school in Edessa in 489 would have been sufficient reason for Narsai to resume his duties. How long these lasted is questionable. Terms of forty, forty five and fifty years have been proposed.[34] All scholars accept 502/503 as the year of Narsai's death. If he arrived in Nisibis around 471 or later, his stay there could not have exceeded thirty two years and with this Vööbus would concur. Acceptance at face value of a number between forty and fifty would of necessity situate Narsai's expulsion in 457 c.e. This leads us back to the chronological problems skirted in the preceding discussion.

Until Vööbus's study, many scholars did indeed date Narsai's expulsion to 457.[35] Following the chronology of the sources would then situate Narsai's appointment as director in 437 (457 – 20 years as director) and his birth in 400 (437 – [2 x 10 years in Edessa as a student + 1 year in Kfar Māri + 16 years of youth]). As McLeod has noted,[36] Narsai would have been an old man of ninety years or more when he was supposedly in full charge of the school of Nisibis. For this reason he accepts Vööbus's calculations which, working backward, are: expulsion in 471, directorship in 451, first arrival in Edessa in 432 and birth in 415. Why Vööbus rejects Barḥadbšabbā's account of two parallel stays in Edessa interrupted by two returns to Kfar Māri, yet maintains the total of twenty years as director, is unclear to me. Once one questions the obvious symmetry of the two ten year stays in Edessa, the reliability of the repeated use of the number twenty for Narsai's student years and directorship is no longer beyond doubt. This is probably why Gero accepts Vööbus's date of 471 for the expulsion yet maintains a date in the late 430's for Narsai's assumption of the leadership of the school of Edessa.[37] Nevertheless, Vööbus's calculations remain the most acceptable and any reevaluation must await the discovery of new evidence.

---

[31] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 609–610.

[32] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 27.

[33] Gero, *Barṣauma*, p. 68–72. Gero once more doubts Barḥadbšabbā's claims that Mamai was the (sole) cause of the disagreement between Narsai and the bishop. Yet he lends credibility to the thrice repeated theme of the lodging of accusations of disloyalty against Narsai, once prior to his flight from Edessa and twice in Nisibis.

[34] Barḥadbšabbā 'Arbāyā (Nau, *Histoire*, p. 615) counts forty years in Nisibis plus six in the monastery. Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān (Scher, *Cause*, p. 386) notes forty five years while the Chronicle of Se'ert (Scher, *Histoire nestorienne*, p. 115) mentions forty and Mari (Gismondi, *De patriarchis*, p. 44) fifty years for Narsai's stay in Nisibis.

[35] For a survey of the various opinions, cf. Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 33–34.

[36] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 6.

1.2 Narsai's Works

1.2.a The Extant Collections and Editions of Narsai's Homilies

Collections

As was the case for Narsai's biography, there is consensus neither among the sources nor among scholars as to the number of works written by Narsai or even the genre to which they pertain. Barḥadbšabbā 'Arbāyā speaks of a homily or mēmrā (ܡܐܡܪܐ) for each day of the year[38] and his namesake similarly notes more than three hundred mēmrē along with "other works".[39] 'Abdišo'[40] lists commentaries (ܡܦܫܩܢܘܬܐ)[41] on many biblical books including four of the five books of the Pentateuch as well as the Twelve Prophets. None of these has survived and Gignoux[42] asks whether the commentary, like the mēmrē, could not have been written in metrical verse form. Vööbus has dismissed the claims of 'Abdišo' as being unfounded, assuming that commentary and mēmrē are one and the same.[43] Whereas Vööbus has simply stated that references to Narsai in the works of Išo'dad of Merv are "easily recognizable as having been taken from the mēmrē that survive",[44] McLeod has in fact traced many of these. He identifies the following cases: Seth was called "image" because Cain and Abel were not the "image of God" (Išo'dad, p. 107,21; Narsai, Hom. 5,[45] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 27v); Enoch and Elijah met after having been translated (Išo'dad, p. 110,1; Hom. I, st. 345–366 below); Abraham didn't reveal God's command to Sarah concerning the sacrifice of Isaac (Išo'dad, p. 173,20; Narsai, Hom. 1, Mingana, I, p. 20); the incipit "Come, o Jew" (Išo'dad, p. 152,20; Narsai, Hom. 31, Mingana, I, p. 299).[46] To this may be added the idea that neither Satan nor the angels heard the commandment addressed to Adam (Išo'dad, p. 78,25; Gignoux, I, 223–226); the waters of the flood came from above the firmament (Išo'dad, p. 119,28–120,3; Hom. II, st. 341–342 below); the Israelites were in Egypt for two hundred years (Išo'dad, p. 153,28; Narsai, Hom. 31, Mingana, I, p. 308).[47] The evidence does indeed seem to point to the validity of Vööbus's theory. Additional proof is furnished by the literal or nearly literal quotes from Narsai's homilies which Išo'dad has incorporated in his commentary without mentioning his source.[48]

Should one concede that Narsai's œuvre in all likelihood did not include biblical commentaries, he or she remains confronted by the fact that of the supposed 300 or more homilies written by Narsai[49] no more than approximately eighty[50] have survived in twenty six manuscripts.[51] The majority of these are written in lines dodecasyllabic in meter while the rest are heptasyllabic.[52] Attempts at classifying the homilies thus far have not proven wholly satisfactory. Gignoux, for example, describes four categories: liturgy, theology, morals and "other".[53] Here he is not far removed from Barḥadbšabbā who mentions a volume of mēmrē on corrupt habits (ܒܝ̈ܫܐ ܥܝ̈ܕܐ) aside from the rest.[54] All of these, Gignoux says, include exegesis to varying degrees. Although there can be no great objection to these categories, the internal division to which they have been subjected seems questionable. So, for example, the homilies on creation are listed separately from those on the Old Testament or those which are soteriological, although all are included in the category of theology. At the same time, the homily on Jonah is included in the category of morals whereas it might more appropriately be considered Old Testament theology, in view of its contents and similarity to other homilies listed as such.[55] Surely all of the homilies listed by Gignoux as theological trace the Divine Economy from the beginning until the future condition and any subdivision is unnatural.[56] McLeod[57] distinguishes three categories of homilies: polemical, ascetical and interpretive or instructional, the latter including mainly Old Testament and typological themes. This classification seems more objectionable than Gignoux's, for all of Narsai's "instructional" homilies, to use McLeod's terms, are polemical to a lesser or greater degree (see, e.g. Hom. V and VI below), depending on the extent to which Christology or other matters of debate between Monophysites and Dyophysites are involved. Moreover, the homilies warning against the wiles of women or corruption of the priesthood considered polemical by McLeod, could easily be included with the so-called ascetical homilies, thus comprising Gignoux's category of "morals".

---

[37] Gero, *Barṣauma*, p. 33, esp. n.38.

[38] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 612.

[39] Scher, *Cause*, p.386.

[40] *Catalogus librorum*, III, p. 65.

[41] This term is other than ܦܘܫܩܐ used by Barḥadbšabbā for the commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

[42] Gignoux, p. 426.

[43] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 69–70. He notes that Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān (Scher, *Cause*, p. 386) makes no mention of commentaries.

[44] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 70.

[45] The numbering of Narsai's homilies in this study follows that of the list of eighty one homilies in the edition of Mingana, I, pref., p. 26–31.

[46] This homily is quoted not only by Išo'dad, but by Išo' b. Nun as well (Q. XXXII, fol. 15v,17–16r,11) with regard to the number of years the Israelites were enslaved.

[47] Additional references to Narsai's homilies in Išo'dad's commentary on the Old Testament may be found in the indices under Narsai in Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, II–III, transl.

[48] See the footnotes to the volume of the translation and the concluding chapter of this study.

[49] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 612; Scher, *Cause*, p. 386.

[50] The number of homilies recognized as authentic varies between seventy seven (my own calculation) and eighty five (Ibrahim, *Doctrine christologique*, p. 97–222).

[51] For a list of these manuscripts, cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 280–293.

[52] These are eleven in total, including Hom. II of the present study.

[53] Gignoux, p. 427–429. His own division is preceded by a brief note as to earlier attempts at classification made by Vööbus and Baumstark.

[54] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 612.

Difficult as the categorization of Narsai's homilies on the basis of internal evidence may seem, the situation is hardly improved when external evidence, i.e. the manuscript collections, is considered. Several of these collections, including that represented by Mingana's edition of Narsai's homilies, are ordered according to the liturgical cycle of the year. However, the date of the constitution of these collections remains unknown.[58] Jansma[59] is convinced that these liturgical collections are a rearrangement of the original order intended by Narsai. His opinion is based on a study of six homilies which deal with the history of mankind from creation to the end of the flood, four of which were published by Gignoux.[60] The order of the homilies in Gignoux's edition follows

---

[55] See below, chapter 5.

[56] However, I do not wish to imply that Narsai's homilies were written as an ongoing commentary.

[57] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 53.

[58] Almost all of the manuscripts are of the late 19th or early 20th c. and none is earlier than the 12th or 13th c. Cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 280-293.

[59] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", p. 212.

[60] The six homilies which form a unit according to Jansma are Hom. 61, 62, 49, 63, 76 and 71. The first four are respectively Hom. II, III, I and IV of Gignoux's critical edition, *Homélies de Narsaï sur la création* and the latter two are Hom. I and II of the present study.

that presented by the majority of the manuscripts. Closer study, according to Jansma, indicates that this order is incorrect. The homily which should be considered the first is that which commences with the first words of Genesis.[61] Each of the following homilies commences with a recapitulation of the previous one and then adds a new theme, concluding with Noah's drunkenness. The homilies may also be grouped by two, the first of which has metrical lines of twelve syllables and the second being written in lines of seven syllables (or fourteen if one considers these lines to be hemistichs). Jansma considers the first homily of each pair to be a dogmatic treatise of sorts while the second resembles more closely a biblical paraphrase.[62]

While Jansma's arguments seem very convincing, one may wonder why he included neither Hom. 67, "On the Blessings which Noah Gave His Sons" nor 68, "On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues" (Hom. III and IV of this study) with the others under consideration. The first is indeed more a "dogmatic treatise" while the second is more a "biblical paraphrase" in accordance with his theory. The metrical lines of both, however, are the same (i.e. dodecasyllabic). It would seem that Narsai deliberately chose to end the thrice repeated pattern of a homily written in lines of twelve syllables being followed by one with lines of seven syllables, if one accepts Jansma's theory. Moreover, if one looks more carefully at the six homilies paired by Jansma and adds Hom. 67 and 68 to these, it will appear that while the chronological order of the bible is maintained, the pairing is awry. For it is surely Hom. 71 "On the Flood" and Hom. 67 "On the Blessings which Noah Gave His Sons" which belong together so that Hom. 76 and 68 remain unpaired. Furthermore, recapitulation at the beginning of a homily need not necessarily imply a link to a previous homily but may instead serve to place the homily within the general lines of salvation history or the history of God's Economy with which the reader was expected to be familiar.

Despite Jansma's valuable contribution, we remain ignorant of the form in which Narsai's work was originally transmitted. Further attempts made atordering the homilies on the basis of their dates of composition also seem doomed to fail. Narsai's remarks in several of his homilies that Christianity has existed for more or less 500 years[63] may serve to authenticate these homilies, or at least permit their being attributed to a writer of the 5th/6th c. Precise dating of these homilies, however, remains impossible.[64] So too McLeod's notion that the mentioning of certain opponents by our author provides a clue as to the date of composition, seems improbable. As has been noted above,[65] the dating of Narsai's homilies is more readily facilitated by a more exact dating of the events of Narsai's life than the other way around.

---

[61] This is not Hom. I but Hom. II of Gignoux's edition.

[62] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", p. 212.

Editions and Translations

To date only eleven of Narsai's homilies have been published in critical editions: the six homilies on creation edited by Ph. Gignoux in 1968[66] and five soteriological homilies edited by McLeod in 1979.[67] Prior to these editions, Martin was the first to publish and translate one of Narsai's homilies, i.e. Hom. 11 "On the Three Doctors".[68] Five years later Mingana published what was then, and still is, the largest collection of Narsai's homilies: forty seven homilies in two volumes ordered according to the liturgical year. In his preface,[69] Mingana provided a list of eighty one homilies, the numbering of which has been followed by all scholars including Brock in the most recent survey of Narsai's homilies.[70] In fact, all further translations into European languages published before those of Gignoux and McLeod made use of the texts presented in Mingana's two volumes.[71] These include the translations of Hom. 35, 39, 38, and 59 by Connolly (1909),[72] Hom. 60 and 66 by Allgeier (1917, 1922),[73] Hom. 39 (once more) by Guillaumont,[74] Hom. 65, 42, 8 and part of 66 by Krüger

---

[63] Hom. 31, Mingana, I, p. 305 and 308; Hom. 54, Mingana, II, p. 120.

[64] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 5, considers these homilies as proof of Narsai's continued activity at the turn of the century. However, the use of the words "more or less" make precise dating impossible.

[65] See p. 2,n.12.

[66] These are Hom. 49, 61-65, all of which were previously published in Mingana, II, p. 100-113, 168-237.

[67] Homilies 4, 6, 36, 40 and 45 of Mingana's list.

[68] Martin, "Les trois Docteurs", (1899-1900).

[69] Mingana, I, pref., p. 26-31.

[70] Brock, "Verse Homilies". He also includes the numbers given to the forty seven homilies published by Mingana, which differ from their numbering in the latter's list of eighty one homilies.

[71] Although Mingana had already published the homilies on creation, Gignoux was the first to provide a critical edition.

[72] Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies.*

[73] Allgeier, "Memra über die Kirche" (1917) and "Memra über die Seele" (1922).

[74] Guillaumont, "Poème sur le Baptême".

(1952-1959),[75] Hom. 53 by Delly (1959),[76] and Hom. 49, 63, 61 and yet again 35 by Gignoux (1962-1963).[77] Pataq Siman later published and translated Hom. 27, 33, 47, 48 and 53 on the New Testament parables on the basis of one manuscript.[78] Of these, the first and fourth homilies had already been published by Mingana and the fifth by Delly.[79] Unfortunately, the majority of Narsai's homilies still have not been edited critically.

1.2.b Questions of Authenticity

The identification of quotes from Narsai's homilies in the works of later exegetes may not only shed light on the size of the corpus of Narsai's works and the genre(s) in which they were written but also help authenticate the extant homilies ascribed to our author. Aside from the commentaries of Išo'dad and Išo' b. Nun,[80] identifiable references to the incipits of two of Narsai's homilies may be found in Barḥadbšabbā 'Arbāyā: ܡܫܡܫܝܢ ܕܒܠܐ and ܚܘܐ ܡܚܝܢܐ.[81] These are said to have been written after Narsai's troubles with Mamai and to have subsequently led to Narsai's reconciliation with Barṣauma. While these two homilies are still known today,[82] two others mentioned by Barḥadbešabbā - that which saved Narsai from punishment for treachery and that on the defeat of Peroz[83] - are wanting.[84] So too, yet another two unknown homilies whose incipits, ܚܝܝܢ ܥܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ and ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܢܝܢ ܒܡܐܬܝܬܗ, are quoted by Mari, are said to have been written after Narsai's flight.[85] Despite the value of this method of authentication, its application is limited so that most of the remaining homilies need to be judged on the basis of other criteria.

---

[75] Krüger, "Die Engel" (1952), "L'homélie sur les martyrs" (1958), "Petri et Pauli" (1958), "Sommeil des âmes" (1959).

[76] Delly, "23° memra".

[77] Gignoux, "Création d'Adam et d'Ève" (1962), "Création du monde" (1962), "Sur le mot «au commencement»" (1963) and "L'initiation chrétienne" (1963). Homilies 49, 63 and 61 were republished by Gignoux in his critical edition of the creation homilies (1968). Homily 35 was republished along with a new translation of Hom. 38 in Hamman, ed., *L'initiation chrétienne* (1963, 1980).

[78] Pataq Siman, *Paraboles évangéliques* (1984). The manuscript used is Teheran, Neesan 1 (1896).

[79] Mingana, I, p. 243-256 and II, p. 84-99; Delly, "23° memra".

[80] See above, p. 7-8. Another reference to Narsai may be found in the commentary on Matthew of the Gannat Bussāmē. See Reinink, *Studien*, p. 24.

[81] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 610.

[82] They are Hom. 25, Mingana, I, p. 210-233 and Hom. 80, Mingana, II, p. 353-365.

[83] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 613 and 614 respectively.

[84] These two homilies are listed as numbers 82 and 83 by Ibrahim in his doctoral dissertation, *Doctrine christologique*, p. 216-217. My thanks are due to F. G. McLeod for making this work available to me.

[85] Gismondi, *De patriarchis*, p. 44.

An early manuscript tradition could provide proof of the genuineness of the homilies. However, as noted above, of the twenty six manuscripts listed by Macomber as sources of Narsai's homilies,[86] almost all are of the 19th c.[87] This means that internal evidence such as references to historical events, christological formulations and debates, style, lexicon and grammatical forms need to serve to discriminate between authentic and inauthentic work. That this is not simple is evidenced by the discrepancy in the number of homilies attributed to Narsai by various scholars. Mingana listed eighty one homilies by incipit in the introduction of his edition but had reserves about Hom. 15 and 53.[88] He also identified Hom. 43, "On the Martyrs" as having been attributed to Jacob of Sarug.[89] This homily has since been located by both Macomber[90] and McLeod[91] among the homilies of Jacob of Sarug edited by Bedjan.[92] Perhaps the most controversial homily is Hom. 35, "On the Exposition of the Mysteries", first published by Mingana[93] and translated by Connolly.[94]

Connolly was the first to devote a discussion to the authenticity of Hom. 35. He argued that the style of the homily was precisely that used by Narsai in his other homilies and there was no reason to think that several of the passages were later interpolations. Oddly enough, Connolly was aware of the fact that Hom. 38, 39 and 59 "expressed the same thoughts in almost the same language"[95] while differing considerably from the thoughts and language of Hom. 35. Yet this led him to conclude that Hom. 35 was a later revision made by Narsai himself, rather than the work of a different author. McLeod, unconvinced by Connolly's arguments, has produced persuasive evidence that the homily is not Narsai's.[96] This may be summed up as follows: 1) Only two of the manuscripts which contain Narsai's metrical homilies include Hom. 35,[97] although the latter

---

[86] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 280–293.

[87] The exceptions are Baghdad, Chaldean Patriarchate 71 (1188/1288), (Olim) Diyarbakır 70 (1328), (Olim) Diyarbakır 71 (14th c.) and Baghdad, Chaldean Patriarchate 72 (1705).

[88] Mingana, I, intro. p. 23. I do not see why Mingana has doubts concerning Hom. 53.

[89] *Ibid.*

[90] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 301,n.1.

[91] McLeod, p. 8.

[92] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, II, p. 636–649.

[93] Mingana, I, p. 270–298. Mingana removed many of the controversial lines from the text but noted them in his preface, p. 10 and 13–14.

[94] Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies*, p. 1-32.

[95] Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies*, p. 27,n.1.

[96] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 36-51.

[97] These are Leningrad, Dietttrich 5 and Birmingham, Mingana Syriac 55.

may be found in many other manuscripts.[98] 2) The formula "two natures and two hypostases (ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ) is our Lord in the one prosopon (ܦܪܨܘܦܐ) of the Godhood and manhood"[99] would not be used by Narsai who speaks of two natures and one prosopon for the union in Christ.[100] 3) The word οὐσία[101] is never used by Narsai who always has ܟܝܢܐ for nature. 4) The antithetical sentences which alternately attribute certain actions to the man and other actions to God[102] would never be formulated by Narsai in this way but rather as the working of Christ by Grace or through the force of the Spirit. 5) The statement that "Christ is united to the bread and wine like God to the firstfruits and so the bread is truly body" leads to a conclusion unacceptable for a Dyophysite, namely that the firstfruits is truly God. 6) Whereas Theodore and Narsai often use the expressions "is like", "as it were" or "the symbol of", the author of Hom. 35 states that "the priest *is* the eye" and "Jesus goes forth from the cup" without further qualification. Lastly, Narsai would speak of the suffering of the "second Adam" or "the man" on the cross while in Hom. 35 we find "the *Lord* performed mediation with His Father" and "the Lord God was reconciled by the death of His *Son* who suffered on the cross".

McLeod's dissertation, which has remained unpublished, was apparently not available to Jammo who incorporates none of the former's arguments in his discussion of Hom. 35.[103] Jammo considers Narsai to be the author of Hom. 35 on the basis of liturgical arguments. The fact that the homily commences with the return of the catechumens and the beginning of the Eucharistic liturgy is an argument in favor of a date earlier than Gabriel Qaṭraya (end of the 6th c. - early 7th c.), when the liturgy of the Word and that of the Eucharist were still separate.[104] The introduction of the homily, says Jammo, is the work of a later author, probably ʿAbdišoʿ of ʿIlam (13th c.), to whom several of the manuscripts attribute the homily. It could not have been written by Narsai because both an initial and a final "Our Father" are mentioned whereas until the time of Išoʿyahb III (657–658) "Our Father" was recited only once during mass. Although Jammo's arguments for an early dating may be sound, McLeod's study would not allow Narsai's authorship.

---

[98] Cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 299,n.1 for a list of these manuscripts. Narsai is one of several authors to whom the work is ascribed.

[99] Mingana, I, p. 282.

[100] See McLeod, p. 26–28. Theodore (Sachau, p. 70–71), speaks specifically of one prosopon and one hypostasis for the union while there are two natures, each with its own hypostasis.

[101] Mingana, I, p. 274.

[102] Mingana, I, p. 282–284.

[103] Jammo, *Messe chaldéenne*, p. 13–25.

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

Most recently, Brock has demonstrated that the creation of adjectives with the suffix *-āyā* was common in 6-7th c. translations, while in the 4-5th c., when no appropriate adjectival form was available, two nouns were juxtaposed.[105] The presence in Hom. 35 of the adjectives *‘ēdtānāyā, išo‘āyā, mārānāyā* and *dilāytā* which are unattested elsewhere in Narsai's homilies are called "tell-tale" by Brock,[106] who would therefore date the homily to the 6th c. To these adjectives I would like to add a list of words which are found in Hom. 35 but which I have not found elsewhere: ܐܝܟ ܕ instead of ܚܪ;[107] ܡܟܬ ܡܢ ܟܘܠܗܐ instead of ܡܟܬ ܒܬܗܪܐ;[108] ܡܪܙܙ[109] and ܡܛܦܣ/ܛܦܣܘ[110] instead of ܐܬܐ ܕ, ܐܪܙܐ ܪܝܟ or ܛܘܦܣܐ ܪܝܟ; ܐܠܦ ܠܒܝܬ ܢܘܚܐ ܡܛܬ[111] instead of ܡܛܐ ܠܠܡܐܢܐ (ܕܢܝܚܐ); ܛܒܥ ܢܘܣܚܐ[112] instead of ܢܘܣܚܐ ܪܝܟ or ܢܘܣܚܐ (ܗܘ) ܕ; ܓܫܡ ܗܝܟܠܐ[113] instead of ܪܟܒ ܦܓܪܐ or ܢܣܒ ܓܘܫܡܐ or ܥܒܕ ܠܦܓܪܐ ܗܝܟܠܐ.[114] One may thus reasonably conclude that Hom. 35 was neither in whole nor in part written by Narsai.

Other homilies questioned by McLeod are 60, 42 and 43. The last has already been discussed above. As for Hom. 42, McLeod objects that a few of the ideas expressed in the homily "seem foreign to Narsai".[115] He refers specifically to the rhetorical question as to where the martyrs go after death if the good thief, solely by means of a word, entered Paradise.[116] It is true, as McLeod writes,[117] that according to Narsai the souls of the just wait in Paradise until the second condition begins. However, I fail to see how this notion is contrary to that expressed in the rhetorical question and can find no further reason to doubt the authenticity of this homily. I fully agree with McLeod's voiced suspicion of Hom. 60, which he would ascribe to Jacob of Sarug in view

of its style.[118] Although he elaborates no further on this remark, I would like to add the following in support of his view: The comparison of Christ and the church to the bride and the bridegroom, the juxtaposition of biblical references to Christ one after another including psalms not recognized by Theodore or the East-Syrian exegetes as christological and the rabid anti-Jewish tone all correspond to Jacob of Sarug's style rather than Narsai's. Parallels may be found in the conclusion of Jacob's homily "On the Brazen Serpent"[119] and in the homily "On Symbols and Types"[120] as well as in the sixth homily "Against the Jews".[121]

Finally, I would like to add Hom. 30 to the list of inauthentic homilies. As I have noted elsewhere,[122] this homily may be divided in two. The first part[123] is a revision of sections from Narsai's Hom. 29[124] whereby the twelve syllable meter of Hom. 29 has been exchanged for one of seven syllables in Hom. 30. The second part of Hom. 30[125] is derived from Jacob of Sarug's "Homily for the Palm Festival".[126] The question of the authenticity of Narsai's homilies has in no way been exhausted. The frequent confusion between the works of Narsai and those of Jacob of Sarug implies that further study of the same may contribute greatly to the identification of Narsai's genuine homilies.

1.2.c Other Compositions Attributed to Narsai

Other categories of works which have been attributed to Narsai are sogyātā or dispute poems, hpākātā and pāsoqē.[127] Feldmann first edited eight sogyātā transmitted in Narsai's name[128] which were subsequently republished by Mingana[129] with the exception of the fifth on Cyril and Nestorius and with the addition of another three not found in Feldman.[130] Mingana considers all but the first sogitā of his edition to be of doubtful origin. This sogitā, unlike the others, is not a dispute poem and its stichs are neither dodecasyllabic like those of mēmrē, nor heptasyllabic like those of sogyātā, but counts sixteen syllables. The thoughts expressed and the wording do indeed seem to be Narsai's, apart from ܪܓܝܙܝܢ used to qualify the angels, who were "angered on account of our sins", in st. 2.[131] Mingana's opinion concerning the sogyātā has recently been reiterated by Brock[132] who has edited a selection of dispute poems including four found in the editions of Feldman and Mingana.[133] Both the hpākātā and several of the pasoqē have been excerpted from Narsai's homilies and in that sense do not really constitute a new genre.[134]

---

[105] Brock, "Diachronic Aspects", p. 322.
[106] *Ibid.*, p. 327-328.
[107] Mingana, I, p. 270.
[108] *Ibid.*
[109] *Ibid.*, p. 271, 288, 290, 291, 296.
[110] *Ibid.*, p. 272, 273, 288, 290.
[111] *Ibid.*, p. 298.
[112] *Ibid.*, p. 273.
[113] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[114] These are but some of the terms which do not form part of Narsai's usual vocabulary.
[115] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 36.
[116] Mingana, II, p. 51.
[117] *Ibid.*

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[119] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, esp. p. 63-66.
[120] *Ibid.*, III, p. 305-321.
[121] Albert, *Homélies contre les juifs*, p. 160-181.
[122] Frishman, "Palm Festival", p. 221.
[123] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 117r,2-118r,21.
[124] Ms. Vatican, Syriac 588, fol. 38r,14-17; 38v,13-20.26; 39r,6.9-19.21-22.
[125] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 118r,21-120r,13.
[126] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, V, p. 613-631.
[127] For a list of mss. and editions containing the hpākātā and pāsoqē, see Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 278-279 and Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 87.
[128] Feldmann, *Wechsellieder*.
[129] Mingana, II, p.366-411.
[130] These are numbers 1, 7 and 10 in Mingana.

Other homilies included neither in Mingana's list nor in the manuscripts of Narsai's homilies but attributed nonetheless to Narsai are the four homilies on Joseph published by Bedjan in his edition of Thomas of Marga's *Liber Superiorum.*[135] These homilies have also borne the name of Jacob of Sarug and although there is no consensus, most scholars admit that if Narsai is the author of any of these homilies, then the original composition differed considerably from the present forms.[136]

Aside from the Joseph homilies, some "Homilies on the Virgins" have been ascribed to Narsai in Cambridge, University Library Oriental 1146 (dated 1658 c.e.). None of the passages I have seen are derived from any of Narsai's extant homilies.[137] In fact, the style and meter can not be considered those of a homily written by Narsai.

1.2.d Mēmrē and Excerpts of Works Outside of the Manuscript Tradition of Narsai's Homilies

Aside from the incipits cited by Barḥadbšabbā and Mari and the references to Narsai in the works of Išo' b. Nun and Išo'dad, fifteen excerpts from our author's homilies may be found in Cambridge, University Library Oriental Ms. 1314 (dated 1897 c.e.). Macomber[138] has identified nine of these as originating

from Hom. 63, 65, 66 and 77. I have been able to identify yet another[139] from Hom. 2 although the text differs considerably from that of Mingana[140] or the mss. used for this study.[141]

Somewhat different is the transmission of Hom. 81 as the first homily in the manuscripts of the homilies of Emmanuel bar Šahhārē (10th c.) on the hexaemeron.[142] The distribution of the variants found in homily one in the main recensions of Emmanuel's homilies diverges from that found for the other homilies. Moreover, all the manuscripts are missing homily 2.[143] This would indicate that the first homily is probably not derived from the same sources as the other homilies but from manuscripts of Narsai's homilies. The wording and Christology expressed in this homily "On the Word Became Flesh" are, in my opinion, beyond a doubt Narsai's. How and why the name of Emmanuel became linked to this homily requires further investigation.

*

In the chapters which follow I hope to present Narsai's thoughts and situate them within the exegetical tradition. The examination of Hom. I ("Enoch and Elijah") in chapter 3, Hom. II ("The Flood"), III ("Noah's Blessings") and IV ("The Tower of Babel") in chapter 4 and Hom. V ("The Tabernacle") and VI ("The Brazen Serpent") in chapter 5 will be preceded by an overview of Narsai's ideas concerning the working of Divine Economy in history, especially in the period of the Old Testament, in chapter two.

---

[131] The usual terms employed by Narsai are "saddened" or "mourning". See for example, Hom. I, st. 4-5.7.10-12.

[132] Brock, "Dispute Poems", p. 110,n.3.

[133] Brock, *Soghyāthā*. These are numbers 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Feldmann and 2, 3, 5 and 6 in Mingana. For a list of editions of sogyātā, cf. Brock, "Dispute Poems", p. 117-119.

[134] Cf. Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 278-279. Gero, *Barṣauma*, p. 70,n.62, mentions Wolff, *Drei Begräbnisgesange* omitted in Macomber's survey. The pāsoqā for old women of this edition is an excerpt from Hom. 27 and apparently the same as the pāsoqā located by Macomber (*ibid.*, p. 279,n.3) on p. 122-125 of *Ktābā d-kurrāstā d-'annidē bnay 'almā.*

[135] Bedjan, *Liber Superiorum*, p. 519-629.

[136] For a recent survey, see Rodrigues Pereira, "Joseph", p. 95-98.

[137] My observations are based on notes concerning this manuscript made by Prof. L. Van Rompay on a recent trip to Cambridge.

[138] Macomber, "Manuscripts", p. 280.

[139] Once more, based on notes provided by Prof. Van Rompay.

[140] Mingana, I, p. 42.

[141] Vööbus, *Nisibis*, p. 71, esp. n.12 and 13, makes note of quotations from Narsai's works in Isḥaq Ešbadnāyā's prose commentary (14-15th c.) appended to his poem "On (Divine) Economy". So too Reinink, *Studien*, p. 49-50, who lists many other authors cited. For Isḥaq Ešbadnāyā, cf. Baumstark, *Geschichte*, p. 330. This commentary has not been consulted.

[142] Cf. Baumstark, *Geschichte*, p. 238. According to Ten Napel, "Mêmrê des Emmanuel bar Shahhare", p. 167-169 and "Paradise", p. 1381-1397, Emmanuel was influenced by Narsai.

[143] This information has been kindly provided by E. ten Napel, Groningen, who is currently completing a dissertation on Emmanuel bar Šahhārē.

Chapter Two
The Ways and Means of God's Economy

2.1 Divine Economy and the Homilies on Creation

The story of creation as told by Narsai is a story of instruction. Each and every act of creation was executed in a specific time and manner so as to teach both the rational beings - angels and men - and irrational beings about the force and love of the Creator and His plans. The introduction to Hom. 62[1] explains the purpose of the revelation at Sinai: God wished to make the works of His force known to rational beings. He therefore chose Moses as His pupil and instructed him in human fashion, causing him to hear a voice. Moses mistakenly assumed that as God's pupil he would be allowed to see His hidden nature. But it was for education that God called Moses, that he learn that God is the Creator. After learning the secret mysteries (ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܟܣ̈ܝܐ) of God's fashionings, he in turn was to instruct the rational world that God is the Maker of all things.

The Mosaic revelation may be seen as an abbreviated version of that which had taken place in the six days of creation, i.e. the preparation of lessons (the order or ܛܟܣܐ of creation) appropriate to the various pupils (angels, men and silent ones) according to a plan predetermined by God, the Omniscient One. Each of the pupils, like Moses, acts in turn as a teacher for the others whose possible errors have been calculated in advance. Thus at the creation of light, God sounds a voice for the first time because it is only then that He has an audience - the angels who came into being along with the creation of heaven and earth.[2] The words, "Let there be light", teach them that God's Hint (ܪܡܙܐ) fashioned them and all things from nothing.[3] Additionally, the heavy labor imposed upon the angels serves to remind them that they are made things.[4] God's subsequent praising of His own creation causes the angels to know that it is right for them to glorify the Maker.[5] This will prevent them from thinking

that they are not in need of instruction.[6] The works of the second, third and fourth days instruct them that God easily creates something from something else (the firmament), rules over His fashionings (gathering of the waters) and shows them how to preserve the order (ܛܟܣܐ) of His activity. Finally, the angels apprehend that even silent ones fulfill God's word (producing of reptiles from water) and consider the varieties of species.[7] It is through visible things that they learn the force of the Divine Essence (ܐܝܬܘܬܐ) whose Commandment (ܦܘܩܕܢܐ) acted as a guide (ܗܕܝܐ) and prodded them towards the teaching of His hidden love.

The angels in turn act as teachers to whom the world has been entrusted, that they raise it from immaturity to maturity.[8] Every angel is responsible for a specific task, such as bearing the moon and changing its phases or guiding one of the other insensible beings. By wearying greatly they point out to man that they themselves are made and not Divine Essences (thus God's plans guard man from error)[9] and by serving man they show their great love for the Creator.[10] Thus Divine dispensation causes the angels to be enriched from the poor entities for whom they provide, so that while giving to the world they take as deficient ones.[11]

With the creation of man our story reaches its climax. That this is so, says Narsai, is demonstrated by the special honor accorded man by God's use of a new thought and the taking of counsel: "Come, let us make man in our image and our likeness." (Gen. 1,26).[12] The biblical verse discloses both the distinction of hypostases and the equality of nature in the Trinity. While disclosure concerning God's hidden nature is unclear, that concerning man's nature is explained in detail. Adam functions as God's image in the following ways: 1) Through love of him who is near and manifest (i.e. Adam), the creatures learn to call in love upon the Maker who is hidden just as a king is honored through his image when he is far away. 2) Man rules over all which he fashions just as the Creator rules over His works. 3) Adam is called father upon begetting, just as God is Father although His begetting is not temporal, nor is there distinction between Him and the Son. 4) He creates something from something like God who creates out of nothing. 5) Man, unlike the animals, looks upwards as an indication of his longing for his (dwelling) place on high. 6) He resembles God outwardly in commanding natures by his word and life force (as the Word and Spirit) that they learn of God's Lordship. As God's image, Adam serves as the bond of creation, linked to the angels through his soul and joined to the mute natures through his body. God effectuated this so that all imitate His love by their love for Adam.[13]

---

[1] Gignoux, III, 1-30.

[2] The angels, according to Narsai, were not revealed to mankind until the time of Hagar (Gen. 21,17-18) in order to prevent men from erring by considering them gods. God therefore cursed the serpent and not Satan (Gen. 3,14-15) because men did not yet know of the existence of the angels, Satan and his legions.

[3] Gignoux, II, 237-250.

[4] *Ibid.*, V, 421-422.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 273-274.

[6] *Ibid.*, V, 277-279.

[7] *Ibid.*, II, 340-351.

[8] *Ibid.*, VI, 71-72.

[9] *Ibid.*, V, 423-424.

[10] *Ibid.*, VI, 259-260.

[11] *Ibid.*, VI, 477-480.

[12] *Ibid.*, III, 240f.

Having placed His image - Adam - in the seemly place of Paradise, God wished to test him by means of the two trees. In these trees He symbolically set the two fashionings: the earthly dwelling through the tree which procured death and the kingdom on high through the tree of life. This He did because Adam's immaturity disabled him from hearing directly about the kingdom on high. This is equally true of man's power of discernment, for without training it would not develop properly. Thus the tree of knowledge not only symbolized this earthly state but would test Adam's wisdom, a quality which the tree itself did not possess, despite its name.[14]

The test was implemented by means of the commandment forbidding Adam and Eve to eat of the fruit. Narsai compares Adam to gold which has not yet been purified. In the one instance, the commandment served as a crucible and the desire for fruit, breathed into Adam, was like tarnish coating him.[15] In another passage it is the fruit itself which acts like a crucible so that by breathing the force of eating into Adam, God acquires the taste of knowledge for him.[16] God restrains Adam from one tree and coaxes him to desire the other, yet Adam's will must decide whether he will eat or not.

Narsai is ambivalent, however, about Adam's transgression of the commandment. At one point he writes that Adam was created as good gold whose beauty God had covered with a veil of ignorance. The fire of the eating of the fruit purified him; the trial wiped away his filth and showed his beauty.[17]

---

[13] For a detailed study of man as God's image and bond of the universe in Narsai's homilies, see McLeod, "Man as the Image of God", p. 458-467. Several of the explanations of man in God's image listed above may be found in the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, e.g. the honor accorded a king through his image, man's sovereignty and judgment (Petit, "L'homme"), man as bond (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 71-72), man's creative force (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 13,n.4 and Tonneau, *Hom. catéch.*, fol. 13r-13v), man as father (Tonneau, *ibid.*).

[14] So too Theodore (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 96).

[15] *Ibid.*, I, 213-220.

[16] *Ibid.*, IV, 67-70. The "breathing" recalls Gen. 2,7.

Elsewhere it is stated that Adam was of low quality gold but after having eaten of the fruit he displayed the beauty of his features.[18] In any event, it is clear from the above that the eating of the fruit was beneficial in so far as the immature of heart gained the understanding of discernment (ܦܪܘܫܘܬܐ). At the same time the transgression plunged Adam and Eve into debt and Sheol, countering their hopes of rising up and becoming gods. The first thing they discerned, therefore, was the nakedness of their limbs which they then covered. The beauty too was only temporarily uncovered, for iniquity, as Narsai says in other homilies, came over his features like filth. By eating the fruit his seemly hue faded and he acquired the color of mortality. Thus the image became tarnished and worn away over a long period of time through mortality.[19] Henceforth man was in need of the purification which will take place at the end of time.

The disobedience entailed in the eating of the fruit is negative. Yet it is also positive in the sense that it uncovers man's discernment and discloses his rationality, the special qualities with which he is endowed and which he is meant to develop. One imagines that these qualities could have been revealed as well had Adam and Eve chosen to obey God's commandment. Yet Narsai never really speculates about this alternative, concentrating instead on the events which took place in the biblical account. God himself, in His omniscience, knew that Adam would sin yet he acted as if He were ignorant. He knew for He put mortality in Adam's nature so that having experienced it, he ask for life.[20] The regret and the threats recounted in the bible are not what they seem, for God acts neither in regret nor wrath. The things set in mortal nature, e.g. labor pains and working in the sweat of one's brow, were decreed as threats in order to aid the more. The test taught Adam's reasoning power that discernment can't be procured without training. The commandment made clear that it is right for man to preserve the order (ܛܟܣܐ) of God's commandments and to hate sin which is the cause of death. The threats, therefore, were not only meant to teach Adam but those who came after him as well, that through fear of death they learn the will of their Creator and love Him.[21]

So too, once expelled from Paradise, Adam remained in its vicinity so that he recall at all times both his inheritance and his fault.[22] If, moreover, it is sin which cast him out unto death, he need consider who it is who gives him life. For God not only threatened Adam and Eve for their instruction, He also consoled them. After the transgression He clothed them in bark, supplying their needs and teaching them to do the same.[23] Moreover, by implanting in them the pleasant faculties of natural love and desire, He foresaw in the constitution of the species as a comfort, especially in time of death.[24] Adam and Eve acknowleged that God is the Life-giver for Eve considered Cain an acquisition from God.[25]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, I, 217-220.

[18] *Ibid.*, IV, 67-68.

[19] C.f. McLeod, I, 15-18 and especially II, 25f.

[20] Gignoux, I, 355-358.

[21] *Ibid.*, I, 369-372.471-472.

The story of Cain and Abel continues the themes introduced in the story of creation.[26] Cain, like Adam and Eve, is instructed by a teacher. This teacher, however, is not God but Satan. Both Satan and Cain wished to hurt God by harming a man: Adam and Abel respectively. Satan was jealous of the honor accorded Adam, discontent at being "merely" the head of the heavenly hosts. Desirous of being like God, a Divine Being (ܐܝܬܝܐ) or Essence (ܐܝܬܘܬܐ), he hoped to injure God by injuring Adam.[27] Cain in turn, felt that he was rejected along with his offering and so killed Abel to wreak vengeance against the Creator.[28] God, however, knowing the wills of both Cain and Abel, had wished to bring them into the open by means of the sacrifices as a warning and not rejection. Yet Cain ignored the instruction given by God and chose another teacher. Whereas God is said to show wrath in order to manifest His love through instruction, Cain does precisely the opposite. On the pretext of affection, he called to Abel so that he might pour out his wrath upon the innocent one, just as his instructor Satan had tricked Eve in order to enact his deceptive plans.[29] Thus by means of Cain the way to death instead of life was paved and Adam learned effectively that he was mortal.[30]

---

[22] *Ibid.*, IV, 262-272.290-291 and Theodore (Tonneau, p. 54,16-55,11).

[23] So too Theodore (Tonneau, p. 50,8-52,9).

[24] Gignoux, IV, 306-307.416-417. Cf. Theodore (Tonneau, p. 49,21-50,8 and Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 22,n.4).

[25] Gignoux, IV, 306-312. This explanation of the name Cain is probably based on LXX Gen. 4,1: ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 47,8-9) and Diyarb., p. 46,6-10.

[26] Gignoux, IV, 306-417.

[27] *Ibid.*, I, 227-240; IV, 105-121.

[28] *Ibid.*, IV, 344-347.

[29] *Ibid.*, IV, 350-352.

[30] *Ibid.*, IV, 356-359.

2.2 A Creation without Hope and Hope for the Hopeless

The consequences of the transgression were far-reaching. Adam lost his glory and was condemned to hard labor. Furthermore, he who had once been a free man was now subjugated to the Adversary. Upon seeing his suffering the angels were saddened and mourned, for they knew that their nature and his were related. But sin had undone the bond uniting the image to creation and the angels and animals rebelled against him. The entire creation was cast into despair, seemingly without hope of renewal.[31]

The intent of God's wise designs (ܣܘܟܠ ܚܟܡ̈ܬܐ), however, is to restore the harmony of creation and lead humanity to immortality and incorruptibility.[32] This cannot take place at once but is reserved for the end when man's childishness will reach maturity. The road to maturity is progressive and on its way men gain increasing knowledge of God and the future world. God's nature, being hidden, is incomprehensible (ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܐ). It is first and foremost as the Creator that God makes Himself and His love known. Although hints are strewn along the path of history commencing with Gen 1,26 ("Come, let us make man"), it is only later, at the time of the apostles (cf. Acts 2), that the Trinity is disclosed.[33] So too the future state is first symbolized by the tree of life in Paradise and revealed more openly in Christ's resurrection from the dead.

The ascending line sketched above is only a partial account of history. For the maturity or increase in discernment aspired for, evolves – as in Paradise – only by trial and error. Although created mortal, man's situation worsened after Adam's transgression. This is because his proclivity to sin increased. Although the expulsion taught Adam and Eve to hate sin and informed them of God's love, this did not prevent further wrongdoing. The murder committed by Cain was but the beginning of a growing intemperance. The mingling of the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain led to the unleashing of the flood.[34] With the effacement of men from the earth still fresh in their minds, the descendants of the survivors proceeded to build a tower of rebellion against God.[35] Although each generation remained responsible for its own behavior, sin's grip became stronger and punishment ensued.[36] The continued enslavement to iniquity and death caused the later generations to relive the despair and hopelessness which Adam had experienced. Without God's intervention the progressive line of history would have quickly been brought to a halt by the downward spiral of evil.[37] But this too God had foreseen and had prepared man's salvation from the beginning through Christ, the true image. Until His coming, Israelite history was punctuated by temporary relief and hope. This was provided throughout the generations by means of moral instruction, revelations and types which were expressed more and more clearly in the course of time.

---

[31] *Ibid.*, IV, 273-289.

[32] Another term, ܠܐ ܡܨܛܠܝܢܘܬܐ, commonly translated as "immutability" but meaning "uninclined", is often joined to the pair "immortality and incorruptibility" in other East-Syrian exegetical works but is rare in the homilies of Narsai. The form ܡܨܛܠܝܢܐ occurs in Hom. 39, ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 163r.

[33] McLeod, I, 53-66. See below, Hom. IV, 254-277.492-503.

[34] See below, Hom. II.

[35] See below, Hom. IV.

2.3 Moral Instruction

The most direct way by which the generations from Adam through the tower of Babel learned to hate sin was by experiencing punishment themselves. But Adam and Eve's expulsion, the flood and the division of tongues were not solely the just deserts of wicked behavior. These were also means by which God accomplished His Economy. Both the inundation and the dispersion from Babel gave humanity the opportunity to live spaciously, thus alleviating overpopulation in the areas of Eden and Babel.[38] Fortunately, men need not learn to conduct their lives properly by punishment alone. The lives of the just as recorded in the bible show that men can indeed be judged righteous. In Hom. 19 "On the Perfection of Ways"[39] a list is provided of those whose behavior is to be emulated, from the beginning of creation until Christ.[40] These men overcame their own passibility while in passible nature, despised thoughts pertaining to the body and occupied themselves with spiritual thoughts. The first was Abel who offered a pure sacrifice in purity of soul. Even though murdered, his death itself is a sign for others to remain steadfast, for their injuries, like his, will be avenged as the crying out of his blood attests.[41] Enoch's translation showed that he surpassed the normal order of human events.[42] Noah's serenity was able to calm the wrath of judgment. Unlike his contemporaries, Noah conquered his passions[43] and Shem, who followed in his footsteps, was worthy of receiving a

---

[36] According to Narsai (McLeod, IV, 45-62), the human race was captive not because of constraint but because of debt. Yet at the same time, all mortals are in bondage.

[37] Gignoux, IV, 418-431; McLeod, I, 45-66.

[38] See below, Hom. IV.

[39] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 315v-320v.

[40] For similar lists in the works of Aphrahat, Ephrem and others, see Murray, "Rhetorical Patterns".

[41] *Ibid.*, fol. 318r.

[42] *Ibid.*

high rank. Through him men were blessed in the name of the Creator (Gen. 9,26) and the blessings flowed from Noah to Abraham.[44] Abraham's love was so great that God caused His love to extend to the uncircumcised nations. Abraham's love raised zeal in other men that they imitate his love.[45] Isaac imitated Abraham's love and blessed Jacob.[46] Jacob even more suffered many oppressions including twenty years of hard labor for Laban, so that he not be estranged from the house of his fathers.[47] Joseph became a slave rather than be enslaved to desires and he served the Lord among strangers.[48] Moses too remained pure in an impure dwelling place and did not worship demons. As a reward he was commanded to depict the creation of the world.[49] He also chastised Egyptians and healed the pain of iniquity of his people, showing that it is possible for men to heal men.[50] Joshua was a disciple of Moses and circumcised the uncircumcised of body and soul.[51] Job more than others denied the value of temporal goods and while a man he overcame passions.[52] Barak, Gideon, Jeptha, Samson and Samuel follow.[53] Narsai devotes the most attention to David,[54] for he erred and saw his own iniquity and bewailed his own fate. David rebuked his own soul for spilling innocent blood and supplicated and repented many times. He received the promise of life without end and from him salvation did come. If Samson, David and Solomon were steadfast initially yet allowed themselves to be misled,[55] how much the more should men uncover the iniquity of their own hearts. For man's nature is weak and while able to triumph like Job, he is easily misled and suffers greatly.[56]

---

[43] For a more detailed discussion of Noah, see ch. 4 and Hom. II below.

[44] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 318r.

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] *Ibid.*, fol. 318v. No mention of Isaac's sacrifice is made in Hom. 19.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] *Ibid.* This Moses did by recording the creation story. A reference is perhaps also being made to the construction of the tabernacle (Ex. 25) which Narsai considers a likeness of the two conditions. See ch. 5 and Hom. V below.

[50] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 319r. This is a reference to the healing of the brazen serpent (Nu. 21). See below, ch. 5 and Hom. VI.

[51] *Ibid.*

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] *Ibid.*, fol. 319v.

[54] The ideas presented in Hom. 19 are expanded further in Hom. 74 "On David" (ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 270r-275v).

[55] All three went astray through women, the most common source of error in Narsai's homilies. Cf. Hom. 80 "On the Admonition of the Daughters of Eve and on the Wiles and Contrivances which they Enact" (Mingana, II, p. 353-365) and C. Molenberg, "«Tricks and Devices» in Narsai's Mēmrā on Eve's Daughters" in E.A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* (Papers presented to the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford, 1991), forthcoming.

2.4 Revelations

2.4.a The Varieties of Revelations

Righteous and even errant figures provide hope in the sense that man learns that it is possible to prevail over his own inclination. Greater hope is provided by revelations which teach men to contemplate hidden things, for it is by means of things revealed that the unrevealed can be seen.

Narsai traces the course of revelations from Adam to Paul in Hom. 2 "On the Divine Revelations which Came to the Forefathers and the Prophets".[57] He distinguishes between bodily and spiritual revelations which are both seemly in that man is composed of body and soul. The reader of this homily will discover that Narsai makes a finer distinction of kinds of revelations which includes revelations of the senses (ܪ̈ܓܫܐ), those of the mind or spirit (ܗܘܢܐ), those in dreams (ܚܠܡ̈ܐ) and in a heightened state of awareness (ܟܠܘ̈ܐ) and prophecy (ܢܒܝܘܬܐ). Revelations by the senses may be either material (ܓܘܫܡܢܝܐ) or immaterial (ܠܐ ܓܘܫܡܢܝܐ, ܕܠܐ ܪܘܟܒܐ). Examples of the former are the material sound of God's footsteps heard by Adam and Eve in Paradise;[58] the voice which warned Noah about the pending flood and commanded him to build an ark, enter it and later to leave it;[59] the burning bush which was seen (ܚܙܘܐ) and the voice which Moses heard with his senses in body and spirit. Revelations in the mind may or may not include visions. The visit of the three "men" to Abraham (Gen. 18) is considered to be the combination of a material voice and a spiritual vision (ܚܙܘܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܐ) of bodies which were not truly bodies. The bodies were an appearance (ܚܙܬܐ ܕܓܘܫܡܐ) and they did not really eat but gave the appearance of eating (ܚܙܬܐ ܕܐܘܟܠܐ).[60] Abraham heard a voice in his spirit telling him to leave his land.[61] The visions of Isaiah[62] and Ezekiel[63] were of the mind and immaterial. Revelations in dreams came to Joseph[64] and Jacob.[65] While thevision

---

[56] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 320v.

[57] Mingana, I, 29–56. Gignoux, p. 428, incorrectly classifies this homily as one of three on Abraham.

[58] Mingana, I, p. 30.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 32–33.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 43(–44).

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 48–49.

(ܚܙܬܐ) of the ladder with angels ascending and descending was a dream by which Jacob learned to be patient in his struggle, the frightful vision of the angel with whom Jacob wrestled was a vision (ܚܙܘܐ) spoken in the name of God, seen by the senses in a heightened state of awareness.[66] The two visions contained one and the same message.

As for prophecy, Narsai nowhere explains the difference between it and other forms of revelations. Those called prophets received sensory visions and visions in the mind or had no visions at all. We may surmise the following based on various asides made by our writer: prophets predict the future, mainly of the people and the various punishments and captivities it will suffer. These threats are generally accompanied by words of comfort and hope of return.[67] Amos lashed not only the people but the peoples as well (Am. 1,3f.)[68] and Jonah was exceptional in that his prophecy concerned the peoples only.[69] Dreams are apparently a lower form of revelation because Narsai explains at length that although Daniel interpreted dreams and rebuked kings through them, he saw everything with the eye of the spirit of prophecy so that the dreams functioned as prophecy.[70] David, on the other hand, was not a prophet although he heard utterances in his spirit and not with his senses.[71] The spirit clasped his tongue as if it were a reed pen and he wrote spiritual melodies.[72] David noted the names of the various singers of songs in his book and these were not the word of the Lord.[73] One final category may be added to those above and that is the ineffable revelation of Paul who went to Eden and heard talk there not heard by man.This revelation, says Narsai, surpassed the normal order of revelations to mortals in that Paul alone tried to imitate the life of immortals.[74]

Revelations may be direct from God or through the mediation of angels. It is not that God can't act on His own; He wishes to show that He is the creator of all things and all things belong to Him. In the Old Testament, Michael served on manifold occasions. He gave the Torah from God to Moses on Sinai, came to Joshua, informed Gideon about the fleece and the dew, and told Deborah to call for Barak.[75] Daniel saw Gabriel, the angel who would serve in the New Testament – as his name Man of God attests[76] – so that he not be considered something strange when he appeared later. It was Gabriel who announced both Elizabeth and Mary's conceptions. Revelations may also be veiled (ܬܟܣܝܬܐ) or hinted at (ܒܪܡܙܐ) or spoken plainly and directly (ܡܡܠܠܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܘܫܪܝܐ).[77] Narsai warns that Elijah's stopping up of heaven and earth, his being fed by ravens and the multiplication of flour and oil in the widow's house all took place openly and materially. These were not dreams and therefore no man should consider the events to be mere allegories (ܦܠܐ̈ܬܐ ܦܢ̈ܝܗܬܐ) but accept things at face value.[78]

---

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[67] This applies to Hos. 1,2 (*ibid.*, p. 44), Joel 1,2–4 (p. 45), Habakuk (p. 47), Zephaniah and Haggai (*ibid.*)

[68] Mingana, I, p. 45.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 45–46.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 49–50.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 41. Although Narsai's speaks of David's "prophecy" (*ibid.*, p. 41), he distinguishes between David's words and those of the prophets. David's words are not called "prophecy" but "songs" in which the word of God was not present (*ibid.*, p. 42).

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 54–55.

2.4.b The Working of Revelations

None of the types of revelations presented in the preceding section may be said to be limited to a specific period of history. Although prophecy is accorded higher status and pertains to a later period of Israelite history, Narsai calls Adam's understanding of the creation of Eve from his very being and his subsequent insight into his own nature prophecy.[79] The prophets have both material and immaterial visions. So too the working of revelations is manifold. Revelations disclose something of the hidden God's nature and will. In understanding his own nature, Adam perceived God's greatness and love.[80] The footsteps heard by Adam and Eve and the voice heard by Cain showed that God desires repentance and purity of heart.[81] In disclosing His will to Cain, God also revealed Cain's secret inclination and therewith His own omniscience. Unfortunately, Cain chose to ignore God's reprimand and murdered his brother.[82] The prophecies of Hosea[83] and Joel[84] were warnings to the promiscuous people,

---

[75] *Ibid.*, p .50.
[76] *Ibid.*, p. 51. The name Michael is human. The name Gabriel points to Christ.
[77] *Ibid.*, p. 42.
[78] *Ibid.*, p. 42. Perhaps Narsai is following the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia in countering the allegorists here.
[79] Gignoux, I, 179-180 and Hom. 2 (Mingana, I, p. 29). So too Cosmas, III, 48-49 (Wolska, I, p. 485-487). This is, however, not the usual form of prophecy. See above, 2.4.a, for the distinction between prophecy and other forms of revelation.
[80] Hom. 2, Mingana, I, p. 29-30.
[81] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[82] *Ibid.*

that they know that there is justice but also forgiveness for wicked behavior. Hosea's threats referred to the destruction to be brought on by the Assyrians and Babylonians followed by the return of the people to their own land.[85] Nahum, Zephaniah and Haggai too warned the people and predicted historical events.[86]

Other revelations provide hope of the future for those who are without hope. These will be dealt with summarily here as a lengthier discussion may be found in chapters 3 and 4 below. The first revelation of hope is the calling out of Abel's blood which was by means of a material voice. This signified that at a certain time Abel would return to life and there is hope for life in general. At the sound of the voice, demons, who had rejoiced at man's fall, were shamed and angels were gladdened.[87] Enoch's translation mitigated the threats of Paradise and made resurrection known. He was preserved alive and as a man, furnished proof of man's not perishing in the future.[88] Noah caused the battle of the flood to cease and through him the curses of Paradise were undone.[89] A second creation was created through him and he transmitted hope for the future to his sons, binding Ham and Japheth in the blessing which he gave to Shem.[90] Twenty generations came to rest in Abraham who was urged to go forth from Babel and in whom the election of the people and the promise to the peoples was proclaimed.[91] The three "men" who appeared in bodily form to Abraham showed the future. God's Son was going to dwell in Abraham's son and His coming was prepared in advance that there be a resemblance between the truth and the symbol.[92] Job showed that the sons of the iniquitous can be just,[93] thus providing hope for the peoples.

The theme of hope converges with that of salvation through Christ, yet Narsai is reticent in his detection of messianic prophecies. These he limits to Isaiah's vision (Is. 6),[94] the events surrounding Jonah's mission,[95] Micah,[96]

---

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[84] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[85] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[86] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[87] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[88] *Ibid.* See Hom. I below.
[89] *Ibid.*, p. 31 and Hom. II below.
[90] *Ibid.* and Hom. III below.
[91] *Ibid.*
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 32-33.
[93] Job is considered to be the offspring of Esau. Cf. Hom. 2, Mingana, I, p. 37.
[94] *Ibid.*, p. 44 and Hom. 58 (Mingana, II, p. 131-144). See ch. 5 below.
[95] Hom. 2, *ibid.*, p. 45-46 and Hom. 14 (Mingana, I, p. 134-149).
[96] Hom. 2, *ibid.*, p. 48.

Malachi[97] and Daniel.[98] Isaiah and Jonah will be treated in chapter 5 below. Micah saw Christ's coming to redeem the people. Malachi sealed the words of prophecy and mission in his vision of the Antichrist and Elijah. He learned from God that he was going to instruct the world through a man. Daniel saw the likeness of the Lord's death at the conclusion of his dream and called Him Christ who is coming to seal all symbols. After His death there is nothing more, for His death fulfills prophecy and it was on account of His descent from them that all things happened amongst the Hebrews.

The outcome of the prophecies at the end of Hom. 2 is no surprise. More remarkable are Narsai's painstaking efforts to cover the entire history of revelations from beginning to end. A much more selective presentation is made in Hom. 5 "On the Blessed Mary".[99] There the emphasis is placed on the transmission of the promise of man's renewal from Adam, God's image, to Christ, the second Adam and God's true image. The mystery of the succession of humanity was passed on from Adam to Seth who was the foundation for God's name and, as the image of God's hiddenness, pointed in advance to the indwelling of God's love in a man.[100] This was but a vague prefiguration (ܦܠܐܬܐ) of future things and it is because of what would take place at the end that man was exalted.[101] For this same purpose God elected the one people and honored the just one after the other: that they preserve the mystery hidden in their members. Seth passed it on to Enoch and from Enoch it went forth to Lamech and Noah. The latter blessed his son Shem and it passed on to Abraham.[102] Abraham was chosen in order to bring life to all nations and from him the promise set out to David and from David to Mary.[103]

---

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[98] *Ibid.*, p. 49-50. In homily 29 (ms. Vatican, Syriac 588, fol. 143v-148r), Narsai cites Zach. 9,9, Gen. 49,10-11 and Ps. 2 and 8 as predictions of Christ's coming. The psalms quoted are two of those recognized as messianic in the East-Syrian church and the interpretation of Gen. 49,11 parallels the fragment of Theodore's commentary (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 304).

[99] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 26v-34r.

[100] *Ibid.*, fol. 27v. There Narsai connects the name ܫܬ to ܫܬܐܣܬܐ (foundation). Seth is said to be the likeness and image of Adam (Gen. 5,3), just as God created Adam according to His image and likeness (Gen. 1,26). This etymology is widespread and may be found in Diyarb., p. 51,14, Išo'dad, p. 107,1 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 184,17. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 64,n.84. Narsai concludes that neither Cain, who was a condemned murderer, nor Abel, who was murdered, were considered images. So too Cosmas, V, 71-72 (Wolska, II, p. 109-111) and similarly Diyarb., p. 51,29-52,3. Cf. Išo'dad, p. 107,21-26 where precisely this passage is quoted from Narsai.

[101] Hom. 5, *ibid.*, fol. 27v-28r.

[102] *Ibid.*, fol. 28r.

[103] *Ibid.*

In this brief account, Narsai focuses in Hom. 5[104] especially on Adam as the (corrupt) image and Abraham's election. He insists that the favoritism shown Abraham by God would imply injustice on God's part if election was limited to the Jews alone.[105] It was precisely on account of the repository of life hidden in him that God chose Abraham.[106] He and his sons are to be seen as guides, showing the way of life to all peoples.[107]

2.5 Types

We have noted the shift of focus from a gradual progression to Christ in Hom. 2 to an almost immediate mention of him in Hom. 5. Neither homily makes mention of types although the terms "symbol" and "mystery" (both ܐܪܙܐ), "prefiguration" (or "metaphor") (ܦܠܐܬܐ) and "guides for the future" have cropped up. One might expect a separate homily on types as a counterpart to Hom. 2 "On Revelations". However, this is not the case. What we do find are homilies devoted wholly to the tabernacle, the brazen serpent, Jonah, baptism and the Eucharist. Some, if not all of these subjects, were long regarded as types in the centuries prior to Narsai. Those listed here will be studied in detail in chapter 5 and the discussion here will be limited to some brief introductory remarks.

Narsai's appreciation of prophecy in its historical context has meant that for him most prophecy is not messianic. He admits a limited number of direct messianic references[108] and adds to these "symbols of the truth (or reality)" or "mysteries" the meanings of which are not directly understood. The latter include the hint of the Trinity in Gen 1,26[109] and the symbol of resurrection found in Enoch's translation.[110] Nonetheless, there are a few things or events so strikingly unusual that they cannot be construed as anything other than a purposeful foreshadowing of Christ and/or the future world. Revelations may be types, as in the case of the immaterial vision which Moses saw in his spirit on Mt. Sinai, according to which he built the tabernacle in the likeness of the two worlds.[111] This is true as well of Isaiah's vision which revealed the Trinity and in which a type of the Eucharist was depicted.[112] That not all types are revelations may be ascertained by the marked absence of the sacrifice of Isaac in Hom. 2. The latter is dealt with briefly in Narsai's two homilies on Abraham[113] and will serve here as an introduction to the author's typology.

---

[104] *Ibid.*, fol. 26v-28r.

[105] *Ibid.*, fol. 28r.

[106] The same ideas may be found in Hom. 31 "Against the Jews" (Mingana, I, p. 299-312). There Abraham's great love is said to be the reason for his election. Cf. Frishman, "Palm Festival".

[107] Hom. 5, *ibid.*, fol. 28r.

[108] Following Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, IV, transl., pref., p. III-VII, I maintain three categories of prophecy: non-messianic, messianic, and prophecies which have a double reference. A similar distinction is drawn by Kihn, *Theodor*, p. 143-144.

[109] Even the angels, who realized that something was being symbolized, did not understand the truth of the Trinity in God's words at the formation of man. Cf. Hom. 5, *ibid.*, fol. 26v-27r, Gignoux, I, 135-156 and Hom. IV, st. 254-277 and 492-503 below.

[110] See Hom. I, st. 103-110 and ch. 3 below.

Abraham, Narsai writes, had suffered childlessness for a long time. Although his trials seem to have come to an end with the birth of Isaac, a greater trial was in store for him.[114] God asked him to offer his son as a foreshadowing of the true sacrifice. God spoke to Abraham in a mystery (ܐܪܙܐ),[115] revealing His plans for creating a second creation.[116] Through a man he was intending to reveal His love as at the beginning through Adam. Death had corrupted His fashionings on account of man's sins and through a man He would renew all along with man.[117] From Abraham He chose that man because Abraham's love was beyond that of all others.[118] What was to be the bloodless sacrifice of his son was necessary so that the Jews not find fault once the true offering was served.[119]

Because Isaac's offering was a symbol of that of Christ, it was proper that the one resemble the other.[120] The place of sacrifice was the same and the journey of three days is a type (ܠܛܘܦܣܐ) testifying to the truth (ܩܘܫܬܐ).[121] So too God received Isaac's death in type because only the blood of a perfect man could recompense man's bill of debts, and the silent blood of the lamb was

---

[111] See Hom. V, esp. st. 19–20 and 75–76.

[112] Hom. 58, Mingana, II, p. 133–134 and 140 for the Trinity and p. 138–140 for the coal as a type of the Eucharist. For the latter, cf. Hom. 38 (ms. British Library, Oriental, fol. 159v).

[113] Hom. 1 (Mingana, I, p. 1–28) and Hom. 3 (Mingana, I, p. 57–68). For Narsai Abraham – and not Isaac – is the key figure, as he is the one to whom the promise of the people and the peoples was given. This is one indication that the transmission of God's promise in a gradual progression (or the continuance of God's providence throughout history) is more important than the occasional type.

[114] Hom. 3, *ibid.*, p. 59–61; 64.

[115] Hom. 1, *ibid.*, p. 18.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[117] *Ibid.*

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[119] *Ibid.*, p. 18–19.

[120] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

in Isaac's stead.[122] This lamb too, which was of Abraham's flock,[123] was a type, for it grazed not on earth but was bound atop a tree as to death, just as the Redeemer would die on a gibbet. John too called Christ a lamb (Jo. 1,36) because He was going to redeem man through the offering of His death.[124] The Redeemer Himself said, "Abraham saw me and rejoiced at the day of my death" (Jo. 8,56).[125] Abraham didn't really see it except through revelation. Christ's death was hidden in the death of the lamb and man's renewal was depicted in the offering of his son who died yet did not die.[126] It was one of Abraham's offspring whom God was going to put on as a covering so that he proclaim the strength of God's only begotten Son. Therefore Abraham's story is recorded, so that through the symbol of renewal men think about the renewal to come. Men die twice and live twice, once in baptism symbolically (ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ) and once in truth. Isaac depicted symbolic death while the Savior died true death on Golgotha, lived real life and revived all.[127] It was only through Christ, Abraham's offspring, that the peoples were blessed according to God's promise, for by his offering men have become the sons of Abraham.[128]

On the basis of the above episode we may isolate the following features as pertaining to a type: the events correspond (the number of days and place agree); they are supported by a New Testament quote; Christ's humanity is stressed (here by comparison with Isaac's humanity); the type prepares the way for the future reality by removing doubt; the type is only a symbol of that which will take place in the future on a larger scale and permanently. Whether or not these features characterise Narsai's typology in general will be seen in chapter 5 below.

---

[122] *Ibid.*

[123] The lamb was not created out of nothing but belonged to Abraham (*ibid.*, p. 22). Narsai seems to oppose the idea that God created anything new after the six days of creation. This may be confirmed by the fact that Narsai troubles to note that the rainbow which appeared after the flood was not a new creation (Hom. III, st. 813–816 and accompanying note). Cf. Brock, "Genesis 22", p. 15–17 where a division is noted between the Antiochene and later East-Syrian exegetes, who oppose a miraculous genesis of the ram/lamb and those, like Ephrem and Jacob of Sarug, who consider the lamb a new creation. Narsai adds that just as the ram delivered Isaac through the Commandment, so Christ would be delivered through the hidden power in Him (Hom. 3, *ibid.*, p. 66). This emphasis on the power working through Christ is found in other types as well and is discussed in ch. 5 below. For the typology of Isaac and the ram, cf. Brock, "Binding of Isaac", esp. p. 76–80.

[124] Hom. 1, *ibid.*, p. 22.

[125] *Ibid.* and Hom. 3, *ibid.*, p. 64.

[126] Hom. 1, *ibid.*, p. 25.

[127] *Ibid.*

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 26–27.

2.6 Narsai's Heritage[129]

2.6.a. Theodore of Mopsuestia

In a number of recent studies, the leading position of Theodore of Mopsuestia – the Greek-Antiochene exegete and theologian – in the development of East-Syrian exegetical literature has been clearly demonstrated. The influence of Theodore's concept of the two catastases on Cyrus of Edessa, for example, has been studied by Macomber.[130] Theodore's influence has even been shown to have spread beyond the East-Syrian borders to Alexandria, as reflected in the *Christian Topography* attributed to Cosmas Indicopleustes.[131] Macina has proposed the use of two schemes derived from Theodore, i.e. Divine Economy and Divine Pedagogics, for the systematic study of Nestorian exegesis.[132] He recommends that the study focus on the story of creation until the murder of Abel (Gen. 1,1-4,16), seeing that it is precisely in these episodes that the Nestorians made extensive use of the theme of the two catastases. Here Macina has undoubtedly been inspired by Gignoux and Jansma, who had already shown Narsai's dependence on Theodore for his description of the workings of the Divine Economy as sketched above (2.1).

It is thirty years ago that Gignoux published his first articles on three of Narsai's homilies on creation[133] which would later be included in his critical edition. Prior to the appearance of the latter, Jansma devoted a three-part article to Narsai's thoughts[134] in which he clearly outlined Narsai's dependence on Theodore for his ideas concerning the properties of God, the Trinity (including the comparison to the body and soul and the progression of Eve from Adam), the progressive perfection of creation, the creation of the angels and their functions, the educational aspect of the prolonging of creation, the two catastases and God's providence from creation onward.[135] These correspondences were once more outlined by Gignoux in the introduction to his edition, augmented by a comparison of Narsai's and Theodore's versions of the history

---

[129] This caption is inspired by the title of one of Jansma's articles, "Narsai's Dubbele Erfenis" (Narsai's Double Heritage).

[130] Macomber, "Theological Synthesis of Cyrus".

[131] Wolska, *Topographie chrétienne.*

[132] Macina, "L'homme à l'école de Dieu", esp. p. 79-92.

[133] Gignoux, "Création d'Adam et d'Ève", "Sur le mot «au commencement»" and "Création du monde".

[134] Jansma, "Pensée de Narsaï".

[135] *Ibid.*, part 3, Appendix II, p. 408-424.

of the fall and man's original mortality.[136]

If, however, Theodore's influence is in fact most evident in the creation story – a hypothesis made by Macina which needs to be tested – then the study of Narsai's heritage must cross the boundaries of Gen. 4. McLeod, in his unpublished dissertation entitled *The Soteriology of Narsai* (1968),[137] has confirmed the Interpreter's importance for Narsai with regard to the corruption of the image of God, the second Adam as the perfect image, Christ's redemptive act and the realization of His victory. If then, the stories of man's fall and redemption are permeated by Antiochene exegesis, what of the period of history between the two? In the chapter on "The Spread of Sin and the Promise of Mortal Life",[138] McLeod states that "during every age of the Old Testament period, God manifested His redemptive plan of salvation and instilled hope of eternal life". The means by which God accomplished this are "through the revelation of prophecy and types".[139] He feels that the types, because they are familiar, "need little comment other than that they signify salvific value".[140] He therefore makes due with a presentation of several types unaccompanied by an analysis. He does, however, devote considerably more attention to the function of revelations, yet after his detailed study, McLeod concludes that "a comparison between Narsai and Theodore (on revelation) yields no positive results".[141]

The survey of instruction, revelations and types in 2.2-2.5 above may lead the reader to disagree with McLeod. Narsai's recognition of but a few messianic prophecies and types is reminiscent of Theodore's commentary on the Twelve Prophets. The latter's approach to the prophets may be said to be historical in the sense that most prophecies apply directly to Israelite history. It is only in exceptional cases, where "hyperbolic" language is used, that one may say that the text points to a reality in Christ beyond that of the immediate historical situation. Thus even many of the quotes from the prophets in the New Testament are considered by Theodore to be illustrative rather than messianic.[142] What has been said of the prophets is equally true for the psalms. Theodore refused to apply some verses to Christ and others to David or Israel. Each psalm needs to be seen as a separate composition written in differing fashions. In some, says Theodore, David set forth doctrinal sayings. Others were hymns of praise to the Lord and still others tell of circumstances relating to the future, prophecying the benefits to come. The psalms also reflect David's personal experiences or are exhortatory.[143] Of all the psalms, only four (Ps. 2, 8, 45 and 110) could be said to be messianic. Narsai's refusal to consider the psalms as prophecy is surely a simplification of Theodore's theories.[144] But it is not only the general lines of Theodore's theories which Narsai adopts, but his imagery as well. Narsai's portrayal of David's tongue as a reed pen has its exact parallel in Theodore's commentary on Ps. 45,1 where, according to the Interpreter, the Holy Spirit is called a scribe by David and the tongue a reed pen.[145]

---

[136] Gignoux, p. 470-495.

[137] The author has kindly made this work available to me.

[138] McLeod, *Soteriology*, chapter 3, p. 143-171.

[139] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[141] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[142] While adhering to the main lines of Theodore's theory yet apparently feeling too constrained, later East-Syrian exegetes, like Išoʿdad of Merv, added several verses to Theodore's corpus of messianic texts. Cf. Van den Eynde, Išoʿdad, IV, transl., pref., p. III-VII, for a list of the verses added by Išoʿdad to Theodore's corpus.

Additionally, Narsai's division of prophecy into categories may very well derive from Theodore. Isaac of Nineveh lists six kinds of revelations whichhe says to have culled from various works of Theodore.[146] These are revelations by the senses, by psychic sight (ܚܙܘܐ ܢܦܫܢܝܐ), by rapture of the spirit, by prophecy, by intellect and in a dream.[147] The first category may be subdivided into sensory revelations which take place by means of the elements (ܐܣܛܘ̈ܟܣܐ) and those without matter (ܗܘ̈ܠܐ). Although Narsai has no official list of the kinds of revelations, one may deduce them from Hom. 2 as I have done above.[148] Narsai's terms and those ascribed to Theodore by Isaac are not identical but very similar[149] and the examples which Isaac uses to illustrate the various categories often coincide. Both Narsai and Theodore consider the burning bush (Ex. 3) a sensory revelation involving matter. That this would not always remain the case is attested by Išo'dad, who records a disagreement between those who follow Theodore, insisting that the burning bush was material, and others who compare this immaterial vision to the three "men" who appeared to Abraham.[150] The problems with which Narsai is confronted when considering Daniel's dreams as prophecy is also likely to be due to his adoption of the distinction made by Theodore between revelations by dream and those by prophecy.

It is not my intention to multiply proof of Narsai's dependence on Theodore here. I wish merely to argue that McLeod's remarks on the relationship between the two exegetes on the matter of revelations and types are not definitive. Furthermore, even where the affinity between Narsai and Theodore has been established, the exclusiveness of the relationship has been challenged.

2.6.b Ephrem

Jansma, in his first reaction to Gignoux's articles on Narsai's creation homilies, noticed a "certain inconsistency in his (i.e. Narsai's) propositions" as far as the doctrine of God was concerned.[151] He was of the impression that "the author was constantly hesitating between two principles". These two principles are those of exegesis and dogma. While Theodore influenced Narsai's exegesis,[152] it was Ephrem's theology which left its mark on Narsai's work. By theology, Jansma refers to the docta ignorantia - man's inability to know God - which he considers to be characteristic of Ephrem's thoughts on the Trinity[153] and central to Narsai's homilies. It is precisely on the subject of the Trinity that Ephrem's influence is noticeable. In the fortieth Hymn on Faith, Ephrem likens the Trinity to the threefoldness of the sun, its light and its warmth. The first two analogies to the Trinity drawn by Narsai are derived from Theodore but the third, that of the sun, is parallel to Ephrem. While the distinction made by Jansma between exegesis and theology is unclear,[154] Narsai's dependence on Ephrem was nevertheless clear. At the time when Gignoux's edition went to press, the author had already taken note of Jansma's criticism. Gignoux devoted several pages of his introduction[155] to the relationship between Ephrem and Narsai, concluding that Ephrem's influence seems to have been of little importance, especially when compared to that of Theodore who was truly Narsai's teacher.[156] As for the impossibility of man to know God, Gignoux argued in a footnote that this is a profession common in patristic literature and figuring in Theodore's works as well.[157] Gignoux's nonchalant reaction to his critic resulted in the publication of yet another three articles by Jansma in which he set out to prove Narsai's double heritage.[158] His wording becoming stronger, Jansma now said that Narsai's discourses could be perceived as "the reflection of a struggle with a double loyalty ... and the interaction of two clashing cultures".[159] It is precisely this which Jansma considers to be extraordinarily interesting about Narsai whose discourses "cannot but impress us as flat and dull and uninspiring" when "interpreted solely in terms of Theodorean exegesis and theology".[160]

---

[143] Theodore (Devreesse, *Comm. Psalm.*, p. 205-206) also quoted by Zaharopoulos, *Theodore*, p. 83.

[144] See p. 27,n.71 above.

[145] Theodore (Devreesse, *Comm. Psalm.*, p. 282) and Zaharopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 85-86.

[146] Bedjan, *Mar Isaacus*, discourse 19, p. 154-161.

[147] This translation is from Wensinck, *Mystical Treatises*, p. 106. Cf. p. 105-109.

[148] List making seems to be an activity of later generations of exegetes. See Išo'dad, for example, who numbers the various opinions which he presents. The compilation of data found dispersed throughout the various works of Theodore, however, is already a standard feature in such homilies of Narsai as that "On Revelations" and may be noticed in the work of Cyrus as well. Cf. ch. 5.

[149] The terms used by Isaac for elements and matter are replaced by ܠܘܒܫܢܐ (ܠܐ) in Narsai. The latter is perhaps inspired by Pesh. Col. 2,17. Narsai's tendency to avoid "technical terms" has already been noted above in the case of ܡܫܡܠܝܐ (ܠܐ).

[150] Išo'dad, II, p. 7,1-7. He does not mention Theodore as the originator of this notion. As in the case of prophecy, Išo'dad no longer adheres strictly to Theodore's words although he does preserve the general lines of the latter's idea. Išo'dad divides revelations into three categories: those in a dream, those in the spirit and heart and those which are sensible, shown to the prophets in semblances and formed from the elements (Išo'dad, IV, p. 2,26-3,3.)

[151] Jansma, "Pensée de Narsaï", part 1, p. 151.

[152] As noted above, this was proven by Jansma himself in the same article (*ibid.*, part 3, Appendix II, p. 408-424).

[153] *Ibid.*, part 1, p. 165.

[154] He applied this distinction to the homily "On the Word «In the Beginning»" which was published by Gignoux as Homily II.

In order to prove his point, Jansma proceeded (in the thorough fashion with which his readers are familiar) to compare Narsai's creation homilies not only to Ephrem's commentary but to several of his hymns as well. He convincingly demonstrates that the section on the Trinity in Narsai's homily[161] is a paraphrase of Ephrem's fortieth Hymn on Faith.[162] Less convincing, however, is the comparison of vocabulary of the two authors in which words are listed from two of Narsai's homilies and seven of Ephrem's hymns.[163] The evidence seems to be overwhelming, yet terms such as ܒܪܝܬܐ, ܒܪܘܝܐ, ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܪܥܝܢܐ, ܟܝܢܐ, ܥܒܝܕܐ, ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܐ, ܣܘܥܪܢܐ, ܟܣܝܐ, ܐܝܬܘܬܐ, ܒܪܘܙܐ, ܦܪܝܫ, ܡܬܘܡ, ܚܝܠܐ, and ܥܒܘܕܐ to list but a few provided by Jansma, are equally present in the Syriac translations of Theodore's works. In fact, Jansma himself has pointed this out for ܒܪܘܝܐ, ܥܒܘܕܐ, ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ, ܚܝܠܐ,[164] ܬܗܪ, and ܐܬܕܒܪ.[165] What began as a comparison of one small section of Narsai's homily has been exaggerated to the point where the reader has lost sight of the difference in degree between Theodore and Ephrem's influence on Narsai. Or does Jansma wish to claim that the two were equally important? Whatever the case, it is certainly surprising that McLeod managed to ignore Jansma's insistent words.

In the following study of six of Narsai's Old Testament homilies, it is my intention to ascertain as far as possible the extent to which Ephrem's works were a determining factor for Narsai's thoughts. If, as Macina claims, it is particularly the East-Syrian interpretation of Gen. 1–4 which has been influenced by Theodore, then Ephrem's influence may prove to be more apparent in homilies dealing with later biblical narrative. While a comparison of vocabulary and terminology are important for such investigation, the context in which they are employed and the underlying theological concepts which they express are of greater interest and may provide some clarity in the confusion introduced by Jansma when distinguishing between theology and exegesis.

2.6.c The Tradition of the School

The quest for Narsai's heritage may be expanded beyond a study of Ephrem to a possible third source. This is the so called "tradition of the school" (ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ) which Barḥadbšabbā says was inserted by Narsai into his homilies as well as the rest of his works.[166] This tradition he lists alongside of Theodore's commentary (ܦܘܫܩܐ) and the traditions of Ephrem, all of which were utilized in the exegetical activity of the School of Edessa. Scholars have tended to reiterate the distinction made by Barḥadbšabbā without attempting to explain what the "tradition of the school" might be. Reinink[167] says that in later Nestorian compilations the tradition(s) of the school is other than Theodore's exegesis, as demonstrated both by Diyarb. and Išoʿdad. Jansma notes that "tradition" is a chain consisting of traditions of former teachers while "commentary" is not primarily a compilation.[168] The two terms, he says, become interchangable in the course of time. Jansma does not explain the difference between the traditions of Ephrem and those inserted in the works of Narsai.

---

[155] Gignoux, p. 465-470.
[156] Gignoux, p. 470.
[157] *Ibid.*, p. 470,n.57.
[158] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", "Narsai's Dubbele Erfenis" and "Narsai and Ephraem".
[159] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation". p. 235.
[160] *Ibid.*
[161] Gignoux, II, 167-172.
[162] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", p. 232.
[163] *Ibid.*, p. 233-234 and "Narsai and Ephraem", p. 60-66.
[164] Jansma, "Pensée de Narsaï", p. 415.
[165] *Ibid.*, p. 418.
[166] Scher, *Cause*, p. 382-383.
[167] Reinink, *Studien*, p. 162,n.12.
[168] Jansma, "Investigations", p. 90-91.

McLeod[169] posits that the "tradition of the school" is made up of opinions ascribable to Narsai which differ from or are independent of Theodore, such as the place and circumstances under which Enoch and Elijah may have met after translation. If the tradition of the school is other than Theodore's exegesis and other than Ephrem, then the tradition of the school is limited indeed. The use of the term "tradition of the school" or "common tradition" or "tradition of the doctors" in later compilations such as Diyarbakır 22 is very limited.[170] The points of discussion do not seem to treat major theological questions. It is interesting to note that opinions presented in the name of "others" or "the school" may be traced to discussions dating to an earlier period and may reflect opinions which were held by Theodore.[171]

More recently, Van Rompay has called for a reevaluation of the distinction which has generally been made between Antiochene and Edessan exegesis. The two traditions, represented by Theodore and Ephrem, show an affinity which reflects the contacts which existed between the two worlds. It was this proximity which led to the great popularity of Theodore of Mopsuestia.[172] The introduction of his works was thus not a turn in history but a natural process. The tradition of the school and the traditions of Ephrem are also to be understood, according to Van Rompay, as "an exegetical patrimony which was gradually formed from a vague and anonymous origin and then fixed in the works of Ephrem, Narsai and others".[173] Narsai's work would thus represent a later phase of the same process underlying Ephrem's commentary and hymns. In the course of time, prior to the official translation activities, the commentaries of Theodore influenced the traditions more and more. The fact that Barḥadbšabbā draws a distinction between the commentaries of Theodore and the traditions of the school may even be a sign that the two were no longer so easy to distinguish.[174] Van Rompay's thesis would certainly account for the rapid and extensive degree to which Theodore's ideas were incorporated by Narsai in his homilies.

Jansma too, in his study of the Anonymous Commentary, has demonstrated that Ephrem's exegesis is often similar to that of Theodore and other Greek fathers.[175] He sharpens his position, however, when hearing in Narsai "two voices speaking in turn, in a dialogue of principles partly opposite to each other and partly complementary".[176] These two voices created an "immense inner tension" in Narsai,[177] whose work thus represents a struggle with a double loyalty. The resulting product of two clashing cultures is what makes Narsai so interesting, in Jansma's opinion. One wonders whether he would find Narsai more dull if he should turn out to be (one of) the first representatives(s) of a tradition in which the commentaries of Theodore had been smoothly integrated while occupying a dominant position.

*

The edition and translation of six of Narsai's unedited homilies will be used to test the various hypotheses concerning Narsai's sources and the integration of Theodore's works in East-Syrian exegesis. Unfortunately, the majority of Theodore's works have not been preserved, either in the original Greek or in the Syriac translation. The present study will therefore be supported by an examination of the later traditions of the East-Syrian exegetes and those said to have been influenced by the School of Nisibis, in an effort to determine, where possible, the influence of Theodore. A comparison between Narsai's homilies and the works of Cosmas Indicopleustes, Cyrus of Edessa, the anonymous author of Diyarbakır 22, Theodore b. Koni, Išoʿ b. Nun and Išoʿdad of Merv may be found in the footnotes of the translation. The latter also include the works of Ephrem, Theodore (where extant), and Eusebius of Emesa. Perhaps, by means of this comparison, some clue may be provided as to the characteristic traits of East-Syrian exegesis and the manner in which these differ from Antiochene exegesis. The works of Jacob of Sarug have also been consulted for this study because Narsai is said to have written his homilies in opposition to the theology expressed in the homilies of his rival.[178] Both Narsai and Jacob studied at the School of Edessa and the points on which the two disagree may also be telling for the history of the formation of the tradition of the school and its receptiveness to Theodore's exegesis.

---

[169] McLeod, *Soteriology*, p. 170.

[170] Van Rompay, in his introduction to Diyarb., transl., p. XXXIII,n.85, lists all the instances where the term "tradition" occurs.

[171] In Diyarb., p. 137, Ḥenana, Michael and the rest of the doctors are said to believe that the fire in the burning bush (Ex. 3,2) was material. Yoḥannan of Bet Rabban and "our Rabban", however, say that the fire only seemed to be a fire. It will be recalled that the former opinion is held by both Theodore and Narsai who remain unmentioned here.

[172] Van Rompay, "Quelques remarques", p. 35.

[173] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[174] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[175] Jansma, "Investigations", p. 144-160.

[176] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", p. 235.

[177] *Ibid.*

[178] The Chronicle of Seʿert (Scher, *Histoire nestorienne*, p. 115), and Mari (Gismondi, *De patriarchis*, p. 44) consider Narsai's creativity to have been stirred by Jacob's popular homilies.

Chapter 2. God's Economy

The study which follows is concerned with the role of Divine Economy in history, especially in the period of the Old Testament. One way in which God's providence may be expressed is typology. The counterpart to God's plans and intervention in history is the degree to which man is able to exercise his free will and achieve perfection. It is the latter which will be dealt with first in the discussion of Hom. I, "On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah" in chapter 3. The interaction of God and man becomes more evident in Hom. II, "On the Flood", Hom. III, "On the Blessings Noah Gave His Sons" and Hom. IV, "On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues" and these are presented jointly in chapter 4. Chapter 5 presents Narsai's specific use of typology, which is well illustrated in Hom. V, "On the Fashioning of the Tabernacle" and Hom. VI, "On the Brazen Serpent". In the final chapter, I hope to arrive at some conclusions concerning the relationship between Narsai's soteriology and anthropology. This in turn should help determine Narsai's much discussed heritage and his influence on later generations of exegetes.

Chapter Three

Creation, Sin and the Restoration of Hope

3.1 Corruption Reversed (Homily I)

A retrospection of thé creation and the fall play an important role in Hom. I "On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah".[1] It opens not on the positive note of creation, but with violence followed by mourning. Sin and death, the two antagonists in mankind's undoing, have preyed upon Adam like wild animals, stripping him and leading to his departure from Paradise. The angels, his kindred of spirit, mourn at the negative course of events: expulsion, corruption of the image, loss of the life-force and the breaking of the bond of creation. The history of the creation and the significance of man's position therein are recapitulated by means of a contrast: what is (negative) versus what once was (positive). The ameliorating explanations offered by Narsai in his homily "On the Constitution of Adam and Eve and on the Transgression of the Commandment"[2] are absent here. Neither Adam's original mortal state nor the pedagogical purpose of the commandment and expulsion are recounted. The emphasis is placed on mortality and corruption which, having come upon Abel, took hold of all men. The terms most often used by Narsai are those of guilt, debt, or succumbed (ܚܘܒܐ, ܚܒ) and pledge, guarantee and surety (ܪܗܒܘܢܐ, ܗܡܝܪܐ, ܡܫܟܢܐ). Adam and Eve, having been found guilty by sentence, were given as a pledge to sin and death. Not only they but their children were vanquished as well.[3] This the first couple brought about by succumbing to sin, signing a writ and subsequently failing to repay the debt incurred. For this reason Satan, in Hom. 40 "On the Resurrection", legitimately claims that the enslavement of the entire human race was voluntary and serves in lieu of the the interest owed.[4]

As intimated by the tree of life in Paradise[5], it was not God's intent that humanity remain in its corrupt and mortal state forever, for from the beginning

---

[1] For the composition of Hom. I, see Frishman, "Enoch and Elijah".

[2] Gignoux, IV, 232-251 and 290-305.

[3] Hom. I, st. 60; McLeod, I, 459-462.

[4] McLeod, IV, 45-58.

[5] Gignoux, I, 199-202.

God "had planned to undo death and make error pass".[6] In love He therefore provided hope for all of creation thrice, each time through a man who was not enslaved to death. The first was Enoch whose translation granted him immortal life and incorruptibility. His translation was symbolic, hinting at the revival of the dead which is to come and offering consolation, despite the inability of both men and angels to comprehend its true meaning.[7] So too his life cut off death symbolically, temporarily lifting (ܐܪܝܡ) - but not undoing (ܫܪܝ) - the sentence of mortality.[8] He served as a deposit of peace and a pledge for the debt or guilt,[9] thereby restoring the pre-fall harmony between angels and men.[10] Important to note is that God provided peace according to His will and plan despite man's unwillingness. He rewards the righteous yet it is on account of His love and not on account of the righteous that He acts. In this way God teaches men to requite love as He taught them at creation.

The second man translated was the prophet Elijah in the second or middle period. Whereas God himself lashed the rebellious in the beginning, He entrusted His active force to Elijah.[11] The latter in turn subjugated the rebellious to Divine lordship against their will.[12] Because Elijah, like Enoch, was pleasing, God rewarded him equally in not allowing death to attack him.[13] The translation[14] of the two teaches men to be good and not to doubt about revival of the dead.[15] Although both were translated, neither the story nor the means of Enoch's translation was as glorious as Elijah's.[16] This is because God reveals His will in grace according to man's maturity and ability to understand.[17] As such the revelations of the middle period were more perfect than those in Enoch's time. Elijah himself saw the way of life to which he was being translated and the fiery chariot upon which he would ascend.[18] He wished to conceal these wonders but the prophets proclaimed them openly so that he himself was forced to disclose them.[19]

Having risen up in body and soul, Elijah traveled to where Enoch was, on earth and not in heaven,[20] serving as the symbol of ascension.[21] The two remained without corruption and were untroubled in body and soul so that they could be unceasingly occupied with glorious things,[22] just as the righteous will be after the resurrection.[23] Thus, the section on Elijah concludes, the two were sureties of peace, witnesses and guarantees of the promised life.

The hope provided by both Enoch and Elijah is renewed by Christ in the third period, which is that beyond time, in heaven and not on earth. Whereas Enoch and Elijah only temporarily removed the sentence of Paradise, Christ made a real end to man's enslavement to sin and death by undoing the bill of debts.[24] His ascension, more than the translations of Enoch and Elijah, reveals the future life, for Christ did not remain on earth but was the first to enter heaven. The fact that Christ, a man like Enoch and Elijah, was exalted, serves to convince men that they too can be glorified. However, Enoch and Elijah remain servants while Christ is Lord.[25]

The translations of Enoch and Elijah, in prefiguring Christ's ascension, determine two turning points in history. At the same time, Enoch and Elijah also form part of the larger framework of revelations discussed in chapter 2.4 above. Their place therein will be sketched briefly in the sections which follow.

3.2 Enoch as a Link in the Chain of the Righteous

The figure of Enoch appears briefly in three of Narsai's homilies other than Hom. I "On Enoch and Elijah", as part of a chain of righteous men. This chain first occurs in Hom. 2 "On the Divine Revelations".[26] Here we are told that God reveals His will to men and that they see hidden things through those which are revealed. God commenced His revelations with Adam and proceeded to Cain and

---

[6] Hom. I, st. 150.
[7] *Ibid.*, st. 95–106.
[8] *Ibid.*, st. 119–122.
[9] *Ibid.*, st. 123 and 130.
[10] *Ibid.*, st. 105–120.
[11] *Ibid.*, st. 191–199.
[12] *Ibid.*, st. 210–206f.
[13] Death is consistently described with bestial terminology e.g. voracious, lacerating, attacking, stinging (like an asp), living in a den (like a lion).
[14] In Hom. I, st. 225, Narsai regards the translation as a reward (ܦܘܪܥܢܐ). In Hom. 23, Mingana, I, p. 193 he says that Elijah's translation is not a reward.
[15] *Ibid.*, st. 227–230.
[16] *Ibid.*, st. 247–258.
[17] *Ibid.*, st. 327–334.
[18] *Ibid.*, st. 295–300.
[19] *Ibid.*, st. 259–274f.
[20] *Ibid.*, st. 321–326.
[21] *Ibid.*, st. 341–344.
[22] *Ibid.*, st. 347–366. Išoʻdad, p. 110, 1–2, is surely refering to this passage when quoting Narsai as saying that they (Enoch and Elijah) met each other and even conversed with the angels. The Syriac word for conversed and occupied themselves is the same (ܡܬܗܦܟܝܢ).
[23] Cf. Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 3, p. 31–41 for the future state of the just.
[24] Hom. I, st. 389 and 406.
[25] *Ibid.*, st. 525–552.
[26] Mingana, I, p. 29–56.

Abel. Through the brothers' offerings He tested man's hidden inclination and in so doing made His omniscience known. Cain's wickedness, having been revealed, led to murder and its vengeance. In demanding Abel's blood, God showed that there is a time when it would regain the life-force. The crying out of Abel's blood not only served to shame demons and gladden angels but also to proclaim hope for human nature. This hope is that of the resurrection, demonstrated next by Enoch's having been translated and preserved alive, whereby the threats made in Paradise were ameliorated.[27]

A similar list in Homily 5, "On the Blessed Mary",[28] is that of the transmitters of the image of God until Christ, the true image. In the beginning God created man as His image but of course, says Narsai, it is impossible for a nature which is created and constructed to resemble a hidden, unlimited nature without composition. God called man His image in love, preserving in the just, from one generation to the next, the mystery of that true image who is to come at the end of time. After the corruption of the image and the rebuke brought about by the transgression of the commandment in Paradise, God gave of His own life-force in Adam's body so that the name image be preserved in his offspring. Neither Cain nor Abel was called image, the one having been murdered and the other having perished by sentence.[29] This designation was reserved for Seth, the foundation of the building of men. Upon this foundation the image of Him who was going to come was built by the righteous, one upon the other,[30] from Adam to Seth and from Seth to Enoch then to Lamech, Noah and Shem.[31] Narsai does no more than make mention of Enoch or the earlier generations until Abram. To the latter he devotes considerable attention before arriving at Mary and Jesus of the seed of David.

The moral lessons to be drawn from the lives of the just are delineated in those of Narsai's homilies devoted to individual characters[32] and summed up in Homily 19, "On the Perfection of Ways".[33] In the latter Narsai writes that the righteous judged between good and evil, demonstrating that man is able to judge the truth. Through faith it is easy enough for man to be righteous so that

---

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 30. See above, chapter 2, for the entire succession of revelations.

[28] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 26v-34r.

[29] See above, chapter 2, n.99.

[30] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 27v. Cf. Eph. 2,20-22.

[31] *Ibid.*, fol. 28r.

[32] E.g. Hom. 1 and 3 on Abraham, Hom. 69 on Job, Hom. 70 on Joseph and Hom. 72 on Moses. For a complete list, see Gignoux, p. 428-429.

[33] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 315v-320v.

there is no excuse for evil deeds. Righteousness consists of battling against passions and desires with steadfastness of soul, as did Christ and His disciples. They fasted and prayed, held a vigil and sang hymns. They refrained from intercourse and showed contempt for property. It is not that food is despicable or physical relations impure; nor was it so that the righteous were beyond need so as to be able to neglect wealth. Rather all these things, says Narsai, refer to the future state and the way of life to come. There men will neither eat nor reproduce but occupy themselves solely with spiritual things, never sleeping but singing God's glory perpetually.[34] The scriptures are filled with the stories of those who overcame passions, beginning with Abel who offered a pure sacrifice in purity of soul. The voice of his blood, exacting revenge, encourages steadfastness of soul in the face of injury. Next Enoch, a man clothed in corruptible limbs, flew with wings beyond passions. He surpassed the normal order of man's life in his translation, says Narsai,[35] implying that other mortals too can combat mortality and depict renewal while bound to death.[36] Many others, from Noah through Abraham, Moses and the prophets, were able to overcome their passions until the time of Christ of the seed of David, who overcame His passions, lived and was the cause of life for others. Once more, a good many words describe the lives of those from Noah onwards while, as in Hom. 2 and 19, but a line or two deal with Enoch and his translation.

The lists of the just in the three homilies discussed briefly above, call to mind the list of the faithful in Heb. 11. According to Heb. 11,1, "Faith gives substance to our hopes, and makes us certain of realities we do not see."[37] The list of the faithful in Heb. 11,4 ff is preceded in 11,3 by faith which brings understanding of the fashioning of the universe. Similarly Hom. 2 and 5 commence with the story of creation and the fashioning of man in God's image. Moreover, the majority of Narsai's homilies either open with the creation story or introduce it later in the text. It would appear that Narsai's exegesis is largely dependent upon his concept of Divine Economy. God's plans for the world were designed from the very beginning: the perfection of humanity which will lead to the second state. This perfection is to be achieved through a combination of education and grace, both of which are a reflection of God's love. The main source of instruction is the creation itself and it is thus in His role as Creator

---

[34] *Ibid.*, fol. 317r.

[35] *Ibid.*, fol. 318r.

[36] *Ibid.*, fol. 317v.

[37] This translation is that of the New English Bible (1970).

(ܒܪܘܝܐ) or Maker (ܥܒܘܕܐ) that men are able to learn anything about God and gain hope of the unseen things of the future. At the creation of man in God's image and likeness in Gen. 1,26, a hint is provided that God did not create man alone, rather there was some force along with His.[38] At the renewal of the world, the just will know how the creatures came to be from nothing and see the invisible along with the visible.[39] Moreover, through the visible image of Christ, man's exhausting inquisitiveness concerning God will come to rest.[40]

3.3 Elijah as a Sign of Peace

The section on Elijah in Hom. I is paralleled by a more expansive version in Hom. 23, "On Elijah".[41] There the story of the prophet's vocation follows the biblical narrative more closely, being punctuated by the elucidating comments on human and Divine nature characteristic of Narsai. God instructed Elijah to cease from fasting and eat, for example, so that he realize that human nature is mortal and thus dependent upon many things including food. In providing him with nourishment with the aid of rational and irrational beings, God made clear that He is able to revive men swiftly if He so wishes.[42] By inquiring of Elijah as if unknowing,[43] and once more through irrational beings (wind, fire and earthquakes), God revealed the prophet's wrath and zealous desire to destroy men. God, however, is unlike man for He loves man and therefore set the goal of peace towards men before the prophet that he aim at it.[44] Similarly God commuted Ahab's death sentence because he repented for having murdered Naboth. But for Ahab's wicked son, him who had persisted in his father's evil ways and was without hope, God cut off all hope through Elijah.[45] The prophet's mission was then completed and God brought him to rest in the "harbor of life beyond death".[46] He was to serve as a sign of peace,[47] a pledge and a guarantee for the race of man. Through him good hope was given to the hopeless, that none think that God despises Adamite dust.

---

[38] Gignoux, III, 251-264.
[39] Hom. 52, Mingana, II, p. 18.
[40] McLeod, V, 217-240.
[41] Mingana, I, p. 181-194.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[43] God similarly posed "innocent questions" to Adam (Gen. 3,9.11) and Cain (Gen. 4,9) for the sake of instruction. See Gignoux, I, 290-294 and IV, 172-185.368-377.
[44] Hom. 23, *ibid.*, p. 184.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 188.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 189.
[47] *Ibid.* Cf. Hom. I, st. 377 for a parallel.

As in Hom. I, Elijah wished to conceal the benefits which were to come, but God revealed them nonetheless to the prophets and Elisha.[48] A vision (ܚܙܘܐ) but not the true substance (ܩܘܫܬܐ) of a fiery chariot and horses came to Elijah, showing man's exaltation and the prophet's translation on high.[49] Elijah was directed towards the vicinity of Eden, not heaven; for Christ alone, in whom the hidden will dwelled, entered the firmament as high priest. In Eden Elijah and Enoch serve as pledges of God's love and peace for mankind and sureties for the writ of their lives.[50] Narsai specifies that it is in Paradise that the two servants dwell[51] as a guarantee of the fashioning which won't be corrupted. Thus Eden is not their reward (ܦܘܪܥܢܐ), for this will be granted them in the kingdom on high.

Only towards the very end of Hom. 23 does Narsai speak briefly of Christ as He who suffered crucifixion for the sake of our renewal.[52] "He is it who ascended with the will that descended to Him and was raised up above" to heaven.[53] In Hom. I, Christ is contrasted at great length with Enoch and Elijah[54] and it is He alone who was exalted to the rank of divinity. Unlike His predecessors, He alone was able to breach the wall of Paradise and allow all men to enter in soul.[55] He then ascended to heaven to minister in the Holy of Holies. He not only testifies to our lives but ratifies the promise, for He abolished death through His death and redeemed mankind. As such He was a king and not a servant, but a man He was indeed. He was a man like Enoch and Elijah, not in rank but according to the nature of man. As one fashioned He was a servant but in rank, Lord and God. It is only through Christ as a human being in whom God, in grace, took good pleasure that men are redeemed.

3.4 The Ascension of Christ as the Gateway to Renewal

How Christ redeems men is explained more fully in Hom. 4 "On the Nativity" and Hom. 6 "On the Epiphany".[56] Both open with God's extolling man with the name of image and the binding of all creatures in him.[57] The joy experienced by rational and irrational beings at his creation is, however, short-lived for Satan prostrated the image[58] and death trampled upon him, corrupting the beauty of his rationality.[59] All became estranged from man and the latter lost hope of renewal of his corrupt state. God, knowing all in advance and wishing to abolish the sentence of death, had prepared salvation beforehand. This He preserved, according to plan, until the end when mankind's maturity would be perfected. In announcing Jesus's conception to Mary, God (through the angel) "sowed His will in the fleshly earth, in order to uproot error and sow hope for those without hope."[60] The words used recall the literal sowing of thorns and darnel upon the earth as part of the punishment for the transgression in Paradise. They also allude to the spreading of iniquity in man's soul which is the metaphorical sense of the sowing of thorns. The replacement of the bond of debts – a result of sin – by the bond of freedom is next proclaimed to man by the census decreed at the time of Jesus's birth.[61] Joseph and Mary went to Judea in compliance with the king's decree and there the news of the "new king" spread. The angels proclaimed good tidings and hope to mortals. The latter then began to write out a bond for their debts in the name of the child (or king) who had appeared.[62]

---

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 190-191.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 191-192.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 193.
[51] *Ibid.* In Hom. I, st. 415-420 Narsai speaks only of Eden and earth.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 194.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 193.
[54] Hom. I, st. 389-552.
[55] The body will be resurrected and join the soul at the end of time. Thus the robber, who was the first to enter Paradise with Christ, entered only in soul. Cf. Hom. 37 "On the Robber" (Mingana, I, p. 327-340) and Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 1, p. 331-334.

Most important in all of the homilies edited by McLeod is Christ's manhood, which is emphasized from the time of His conception. God took one man from among the guilty[63] and made Him victorious so that He acquit Adam. It was through sin that men succumbed to death but because Christ was steadfast and sinless, death's claim upon him was unjust.[64] By death the Calumniator sealed humanity's bond of debts and by death on the cross, Christ tore up the bond of debtors and wrote out and sealed the new writ of man's redemption with His own blood.[65] It is impossible, says Narsai, that the Word came into

---

56 McLeod, I and II respectively.

[57] One of the reasons Narsai gives for man's being called image is that he forms the bond of the universe. See above, ch. 2, p. 23,n.13.

[58] McLeod, I, 33.

[59] McLeod, II, 31-32.

[60] McLeod, I, 105-106.

[61] McLeod, I, 235-246. Cf. Col. 2,14 for the bond of debts. This becomes the bond of freedom and also the bond of life in McLeod, I, 256; IV, 51.108-109.138.

[62] McLeod, I, 255-256.

[63] Or from those who were in debt or vanquished.

[64] McLeod, IV, 95-100. Death's claim upon Christ was unjust, as opposed to his rightful claim on Adam and his descendants.

[65] McLeod, IV, 101-112 and 135-138.

being, grew in a womb and was passible. How could one who was deficient in nothing be anointed and filled with the spirit? Surely only one who is wanting acquires great rank by anointment.[66] Jesus was a man in body and soul, save for iniquity and just as He was resurrected body and soul, so He will come in body and soul to renew and resurrect men in body and soul.[67] He was a man but was given the name God because He became the dwelling place for God and was equal with the Word in authority and rank.[68] He was a man but unlike men in that by grace he became heir and Lord.

Christ alone rose up to heaven and received a majesty not attained by created things. He ascended on high on a chariot in the sight of rational and irrational beings and entered the gate of the firmament through which none before Him had passed. He truly reconciled angels with men and both recognize themselves in Him, in His body and soul. As such He functions as the true (i.e. eternal) image of God and bond of the universe. He opened the way towards life and caused all to be raised up in life with him.

A new period was inaugurated by Christ's ascension. Until the time of the resurrection men will not enter the second state. However, men are able to participate with Christ, enjoying a taste of the future through baptism and the Eucharist. When time really comes to an end, all men, evil and just, will become immortal and passions of the body and torments of the soul will cease.[69] The just among celestial and corporeal beings will be raised up on high, like Jesus, on a spiritual chariot which is none other than the Divine Hint[70] and men will acquire wings to fly on high.[71] The wings of death, contrarily, will be broken and men will ask, "Where is your sting?". There will be no need for seasons or food and thus the angels will cease activity and all will come to a halt. One sole occupation will engage them all: the contemplation of God's hiddenness through the visible image of Christ. This will result in the united offering of praise and thanksgiving.

The themes of Divine pedagogics, man's gradual progression to maturity, God's love for His creation and the provision of hope through revelation – all present in Narsai's Hom. "On the Translation of Enoch and Elijah" - are common to the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The dependence of Christ's efficacy on his manhood are equally stressed by Theodore and Narsai. The dependence of the latter on the former seems clear. However, of the works of Theodore, only a few brief remarks concerning Enoch and Elijah remain,[72] making verification difficult. The next sections of this chapter will therefore be devoted firstly to a comparison of Narsai and Ephrem's understanding of how Enoch and Elijah were pleasing.[73] The differences which emerge are significant and stem from disparate evaluations of man's moral potential. An analysis of the latter and further comparison with Jacob of Sarug will help crystallize Narsai's position despite the absence of Theodore's commentary.

---

[66] McLeod, II, 341-344.

[67] Hom. 18 (Mingana, I, p. 322). Cf. Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 2, p. 483-484.

[68] McLeod, I, 431-438; II, 451-454.

[69] Cf. Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 3, p. 25.

[70] *Ibid.*, part 2, p. 466.

[71] Hom. 52 (Mingana, II, p. 13). Cf. Gignoux, *art. cit.*, part 3, p. 29-31.

3.5 Ephrem's Understanding of How Enoch and Elijah Pleased God

Ephrem writes the following about Enoch in his commentary on Genesis: "He (Moses) wrote concerning Enoch that 'he was pleasing to God and was no more' (Gen. 5,24). They say that He translated him to Paradise while Adam was looking at him, lest he (Adam) think that he (Enoch) was killed like Abel and be pained. Also, that he be comforted by the righteous son who had come forth from him and know that all who resemble this one, whether before death or after the resurrection, will have their meeting place there."[74] The words attributed to Moses are based on Pesh. Gen. 5,24: ܘܫܦܪ ܚܢܘܟ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ. Enoch's "translation", however is derived neither from the Pesh. (ܡܛܠ ܕܫܢܝܗ ܐܠܗܐ) nor from the Masoretic text (כי לקח אתו אלהים). The notion of Enoch having been translated most likely originates from Heb. 11,5 where, according to the Syriac version, on account of his faith, Enoch was translated (ܐܫܬܢܝ) and did not taste (ܛܥܡ) death.[75] How Enoch was pleasing and why he was translated to Paradise are explained further not in

---

[72] Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 244,6-15).

[73] The comparison with Ephrem in this study will include both his commentary on Genesis and Exodus and his hymns. As for the commentary, Beck (*Parad.*, transl., p. 47,n.5) and more recently Kowalski (*Perfezione*, p. 42,n.22) have voiced doubts concerning its authenticity. However, the isolated cases of disagreement between the commentary and hymns to which they point, do not outweigh the basic identity of ideas expressed in the two bodies of work.

[74] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,7-11).

[75] According to LXX, Gen. 5,24, Enoch was translated (ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός). The same verb is found in Heb. 11,5. However, it is not necessary to assume that Ephrem's remarks are based on LXX. The use of "taste" in the Syriac of Heb. 11,5, as opposed to "see" in the Greek (μὴ ἰδεῖν), allows for a contrast between Enoch, who did not taste death, and Adam who did so literally by eating of the fruit.

Ephrem's commentary but in his hymns.[76]

In his first hymn "On the Nativity" Ephrem writes: "Seth, Enosh and Cainan were called the sons of God. They waited (ܣܟܝܘ) for the Son of God, that they through mercy might be His brethren."[77] This parallels his commentary on both Gen. 4,26[78] and Gen. 6,2 where the "sons of God" are said to be the sons of Seth, "they who like the righteous sons of Seth[79] were designated as the people of God".[80] The commentary attributes a passive meaning to the verb "call" in Gen. 4,26 ("Then he/men began to be called by the name of the Lord") which would seem to be influenced by the Septuagint reading and not the Pesh.[81] The hymn, however, seems to make use of the active sense of the verb. The LXX ἤλπισεν (he hoped) which serves to translate the MT הוחל may be the source of ܣܟܝܘ. Thus Seth, Enosh and Cainan not only were called the "sons of God", they also "hoped to invoke the name of the Lord" or, paraphrastically, they "placed their hope (i.e. trust) in Christ.[82] In the same hymn, this very waiting and even yearning (ܐܬܪܓܪܓ ܠ) for the Son led Enoch to believe to such an extent that he was justified[83] in order that he "ascend and see Him in heaven".[84] Not only Enoch but other righteous of the antediluvian generations yearned to see the Son. These are listed chronologically in the first hymn "On the Nativity" and are complemented by descriptions of the longed-for Christ. Thus in skillful fashion the characteristics of both the righteous and Christ - who outweighs their total - are presented. Abel first yearned (ܐܬܪܓܪܓ ܠ, like Enoch later) for Christ to come in his days "that he should see, instead of the lamb which he offered up, the Lamb of God".[85] Seth, the murdered Abel's replacement, looked for the killed Son who would put an end to death.

---

[76] Most of the references to Enoch which follow are derived from Kronholm, *Motifs*. The arrangement of the material, however, is my own.

[77] Beck, *Nat.* I,48-56. Cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 163-164.

[78] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,29-55,3).

[79] Or "like the sons of the righteous Seth". Cf. Jansma, "Beiträge", p. 68.

[80] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,1-3).

[81] LXX reads ἐπικαλεῖσθαι which may be understood as either "to call upon the name of the Lord God" or "was called by...". Pesh. ܫܪܝ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܒܫܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ clearly has an active sense. Fraade, *Enosh*, p. 92-93, conjectures that Ephrem may have derived his interpretation of Gen. 4,26 from traditions that understood LXX passively. He notes that Eusebius of Emesa and Didymus in Egypt interpreted the verse as "hoped to be called by the name of the Lord".

[82] For a detailed study of Gen. 4,26 and its Christian and rabbinic interpretations, see Fraade, *Enosh*.

[83] Rom. 4,2.

[84] Beck, *Nat.* I,53.

[85] Beck, *Nat.* I,42; Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 146.

Similarly, Lamech looked for the Son so as to be consoled in his labor on the earth cursed by God. Not having found the Son, he was nevertheless consoled by his own son Noah in whom he saw His symbol.[86] Noah too, seeing that the holy (ܩܕܝ̈ܫܐ) sons of God had become wanton, waited for the holy Son by whom harlots were made abstinent (ܐܬܢܟܦܘ).[87]

Enoch's pleasingness was not, however, restricted to his desire to see Christ. His righteousness[88] is also related to his chastity (ܐܬܢܟܦ). Not surprisingly, physical purity is also attributed to Abel, Seth and Noah. Abel offered in innocence[89] and chastity (ܢܟܦܘܬܐ).[90] Seth did not mingle with the offspring of Cain but later generations of his family did, disregarding the continence (ܢܛܝܪܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ) and modesty (ܢܟܝܟܘܬܐ) which they had maintained.[91] Noah resisted physical desire as represented by the daughters of Cain, not only abstaining sexually himself but causing all in the ark, including the animals to do likewise![92]

Aside from the earlier generations, Elijah too purified himself. This purity and Enoch's abstinence are juxtaposed in *Eccl.* XLIX,11-12 and contrasted with the physical defeat of Adam and Eve. The latter were defeated and departed from Paradise - Adam through his wife, Eve - while the other two were victorious and entered on account of their virtue. As such Enoch and Elijah chastise Adam and Eve, reversing their fall typologically.

3.6 Ephrem's Concept of Mortality, Immortality and Free Will

Having eaten of the forbidden fruit in Paradise, Adam and Eve were expelled and doomed to taste death. But was this their inevitable fate from the start? Surely not, says Ephrem, for had Adam been created deficient, he would not have entered Paradise.[93] He was formed pure and glorious of virgin soil[94] and was himself in virginal state. The terms employed are ܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ,[95] ܢܟܦܐ[96] and ܩܕܝܫ,[97] all clearly reminiscent of those used to describe Enoch

---

[86] Beck, *Nat.* I,56; Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 164.

[87] Beck, *Nat.* I,22; Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 170.

[88] For Enoch as a righteous one see e.g. Beck, *Eccl.* XI,1 where Enoch is called righteous among those killed (ܒܝܬ ܩܛܝ̈ܠܐ ܙܕܝܩܐ).

[89] Beck, *Crucif.* II,9,1; Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 147.

[90] Beck, *Virg.* XLIV,21,2; Kronholm, *Motifs* 147.

[91] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,1-21 esp. l.16-17).

[92] Beck, *CNis.* I,4,3-9.

[93] Beck, *CH.* XX,8,7-9.

[94] Beck, *Nat.* II,12,3-4.

[95] Beck, *Virg.* III,2,1.

and/or Elijah. Obviously it was not only in soul but in body as well that Adam was exalted and able to enter Paradise as one pure and perfect.[98] There the two trees were located, the one of life-force and the other of wise designs, the "pair of blessed fountains of all bounties".[99] All things having been put in grace at their disposal, Adam and Eve were justly[100] restrained from eating of the tree of life by means of a commandment. Having been created neither mortal nor immortal, the choice was theirs to obey or transgress the commandment. This they were to do out of free will because they were already able to distinguish between good and evil (ܦܘܪܫܢ ܠܛܒܬܐ ܘܒܝܫܬܐ),[101] even if they had experienced only the former thus far.[102] Had they obeyed they would have become God's likeness (ܕܡܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ),[103] endowed with immortal life and unerring wisdom[104] in justice.[105] However, obedient they were not and there was nothing to prevent them from eating of the second tree as well. Therefore, in an extreme act of mercy, God expelled them from Paradise and made them mortal so that having been cursed they would not live in anguish eternally.[106]

The death sentence to which Adam was condemned, although itself an act of grace, was postponed in grace[107] so that not Adam but Abel was the first to die. Abel offered to God in innocence,[108] and chastity[109] and was himself altogether desirable,[110] as was Adam prior to the fall. Cain murdered his brother and attempted to deceive his parents, claiming that Abel "had entered Paradise because he was pleasing to God (ܫܦܪ ܠܐܠܗܐ). And see! his accepted sacrifice attests to his entry. For keeping the commandment leads to entrance in

---

[96] Beck, *Ieiunio* III,2,5.

[97] Beck, *Azym.* XIV,6,2,; cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 64.

[98] Beck, *Parad.* VIII,9,1-5.

[99] Beck, *Parad.* XII, 15,1-3.

[100] For a discussion of Ephrem's concepts of justice and grace see below, ch. 4.

[101] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 37,10-13.20-30). Ephrem provides a number of appropriate replies which Eve could have given the serpent had she so wished.

[102] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 45,21-25).

[103] Beck, *Parad.* XII,15,5. This is Ephrem's interpretation of Gen. 3,5 (You shall be like - ܐܝܟ - God) and Gen. 3,22 (See man has become like - ܐܝܟ - one of us).

[104] *Ibid.*, 15,6 and XII,17,4f.

[105] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 34,22-35,7). Immortality would not be the result of grace but justly deserved.

[106] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 46,8-17).

[107] Beck, *Eccl.* L,4.

[108] Beck, *Crucif.* II,9,1.

[109] Beck, *Virg.* XLIV,21,2.

[110] Beck, *CH.* XVIII,7,8; Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 147.

Paradise, just as your transgression of the commandment cast you out of there."[111] Although these words constitute a lie, they are the first inkling of what would happen indeed to Enoch. As one chaste and righteous, Enoch truly pleased God and it was he who was the first to enter Paradise after Adam's expulsion. Abel neither escaped the jaws of death nor was forgotten. His blood cried out as a sure sign of recompense; the type of Christ's resurrection and future life.[112]

Adam and Eve were grieved at the death of their son but the grace of the postponement of their death sentence consisted of this: that they lived to see Enoch enter Paradise and were consoled.[113] As Adam had once tasted the fruit, he now tasted grace (ܛܥܡܗ̇ ܠܛܝܒܘܬܐ)[114] and understood that there was hope of his returning to his inheritance.

The chastisement and the consolation offered Adam were effective because Enoch, and later Elijah, were victorious in the same flesh by which Adam was vanquished.[115] Enoch's perfection attests to the fact that Adam too was able to be perfect for the two were of the same nature. Because of this perfection, Enoch was led by justice and goodness to the tree of life, located in the innermost part of Paradise and he ate of it. Through justice he was made to live (eternally) and in grace he was magnified.[116] Elijah's ascent attests more explicitly than Enoch's to the fact that the perfect have entered and will enter Paradise in *body* and soul.[117] First, his body was not found by those who sought it, and second, he cast off his cloak which is but the temporal garb and retained his body, the true covering. The waters of the Jordan even abandoned their course and flowed backwards to indicate the flight of the body on high.[118]

Finally, both Enoch and Elijah not only reverse Adam and Eve's fall typologically, they are also types of Christ through whom all will be revived. Their humanity points to His and makes clear that it is not because He is God that Christ triumphed in the contest, but on account of his purity and

---

[111] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 49,15-19). A parallel may be found in Brock, "Life of Abel", §11, p. 478 and 489, note 11. According to Aptowitzer, *Kain und Abel*, p. 25, Ephrem is opposing here the idea of Abel's ascension.

[112] Beck, *CNis.* LXXXI,7. The commentary makes no mention of a future life or Christ. The typological references in the commentary are, however, scant.

[113] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,6-11).

[114] Beck, *Eccl.* L,5.

[115] Beck, *Eccl.* XLIX,12.

[116] Beck, *Eccl.* L,2.

[117] Beck, *CNis.* LXXI,5 where Enoch is said to have obtained life, firstly to console Adam when he heard that he would return to dust and secondly to show that both the body and soul will live eternally. Cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 162.

[118] Beck, *CNis.* XLIII,24-27.

perfection.[119] Once more the message is twofold: 1) Adam, had he so desired, could have entered the innermost part of Paradise, the Holy of Holies,[120] and lived eternally. That he failed to do so was a question of his own free will. Others chose freely to obey God and gained immortality. 2) There is hope and consolation for Adam and those after him through Christ.

3.7 A Comparison of Narsai and Ephrem

For both Ephrem and Narsai, Enoch and Elijah give consolation and hope of the future immortal life in the resurrection of body and soul by means of their translation. As such they are types of Christ who was resurrected and will revive mankind. Christ's humanity is especially important, as only one who is victorious in the body can rebuke those in the body (Ephrem) and cause them to live (Ephrem and Narsai). Here, however, the similarity ends. The differences are far from inconsequential for they reflect the authors' opposing views of man's moral potential as manifested at creation. If, in the words of Ephrem, Adam was formed neither mortal nor immortal and at the same time gifted with the ability to discern between good and evil, he was capable of choosing immortality without much ado from the start. His transgression and subsequent mortality are the more flagrant in view of the aforesaid. His evil conduct is contrasted with God's measures of justice (ܟܐܢܘܬܐ) and grace (ܛܝܒܘܬܐ). According to the measure of justice Adam should have earned, by the keeping of the commandment, that which he received in Paradise gratuitously. Moreover, according to this same measure, he deserved punishment for failing to do so. Grace, however, intervened and spared man from the worst, as it would repeatedly do thereafter.

On the other hand, man need not rely entirely upon grace, for he is not permanently subjugated to death. The righteous, like Enoch and Elijah, may enter Paradise and even eat of the tree of life, whether before or after the resurrection. Righteousness as described in the biblical narrative, however, does not suffice for Ephrem. For the author, righteousness is comprised of faith, especially in Christ, as well as of sexual purity or asceticism. Thus Ephrem stresses the chastity of Abel, Seth, Enosh, Enoch and Noah and their longing to see the Son.

The element of faith, moreover, entails perfect faith to the exclusion of all doubt. Abraham, for example, believed unerringly both that Sarah would bear him a son and that he would inherit the land God showed him. The questioning on his part (Gen. 15,8), Ephrem explains, was not as to whether he would inherit the land but how.[121] Similarly, he laughed (Gen. 17,17) not because he doubted that Sarah would bear a child but out of love for Ishmael.[122] Those to whom doubt is attributed, e.g. Adam, Eve, Cain and Sarah, are portrayed more negatively than in the bible. The first two were condemned after having obviated reconciliation by refusing to repent.[123] Their opportunities to repent were manifold yet they increased the evil of their transgression by ignoring these. Cain's anger, says Ephrem, was not evoked by the rejection of his offer but by his possible subjection to the ridicule of his family. He could have offered another offer or beseeched God yet did not do so.[124] His words, "my offense is too great to be forgiven" (Gen. 4,13) were to no avail because they were uttered under the duress of punishment.[125] Lastly, Sarah's laugh (Gen. 18,12) and its denial contrast with Abraham's unflagging faith. Although Ephrem, concurring with the bible (Gen. 18,15), concedes that Sarah was afraid, he notes that she could and would have received a sign from God upon request.[126] In conclusion: the righteousness of the righteous is magnified but so is the imperfection (and even the wickedness) of the imperfect. This is not surprising in light of Ephrem's theoretical view that man may easily choose good. In reality man more often fails than not and this failure is perforce strongly condemned.

---

[119] Beck, *Eccl.* XLIX,21.

[120] For Paradise in terms of the sanctuary and tabernacle, cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 72-73, Anderson, "Cosmic Mountain", and Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 49-57.

It is clear from Narsai's homilies on creation[127] that man, according to the author, was created mortal. This position may be less easily reconciled than Ephrem's with the notion of man's free will. Narsai claims that man's mortality was part of the Divine Economy, determined in advance by God who thereby equipped man in grace for earthly life. More fundamental is that prior to the transgression man's discernment had not been effectuated. The test was instituted so that man's power of discernment not remain unexercised. Eating of the tree both clouded man's features[128]and catalysed his development. This development

---

[121] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 70,26–71,2).

[122] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 74,5–19).

[123] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 41,38–42,19; 43,10–16).

[124] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 48,10–30).

[125] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 50,19–24).

[126] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 76,1–12).

[127] Cf. Gignoux, p. 494–495.

[128] McLeod, II, 25–26.257–258. The opposite, however, is also claimed by Narsai. See above, ch. 2.1

was to continue for many generations until the second catastasis and man's participation in it were initiated by Christ's death and resurrection. Whereas the entrance into Paradise by Enoch and Elijah in this life and by others after the resurrection basically constitutes a return or restoration for Ephrem, this does not hold true for Narsai. For the latter, Eden is but the waiting room for Enoch and Elijah (in body and soul) and, since the thief's entrance (Lk. 23,42–43), for the righteous as well (in soul only) until the final resurrection. At that time renewal or transition to the age to come will occur. The life which Adam may have had, had he not eaten from the tree, is not the same life which the righteous will lead in the kingdom on high.

Narsai's acceptance and inclusion of man's imperfection as part of the Divine Economy allow him to regard even the righteous, such as Elijah, as fallible. Punishment as such is not rebuke, to be tempered by grace, but a learning experience. Expulsion from Paradise instructs man to hate sin and Cain's punishment, while deserved because his repentance was provoked under duress, served to warn future generations against killing.[129] Narsai's humanity can't achieve the perfection which Ephrem's can but it is also never quite as wicked despite its permanent subjugation to sin and death. Enoch and Elijah, therefore, need not rebuke men but offer hope of a life other than this one, incorruptible and immortal; a life to be inaugurated by a man like them in body and soul who was raised up to the Divine rank in grace.

3.8 Jacob of Sarug in Ephrem's Footsteps

In Alwan's recently published edition of four of Jacob of Sarug's homilies on creation[130] an astonishing correspondence to Ephrem's thoughts as delineated above may be noted. Hom. II entitled "Was Adam Created Mortal or Immortal" leads us to the heart of the matter. Man, says Jacob, was created neither mortal nor immortal. Had God determined his mortality from the start, why need He have used the tree as a pretext (ܥܠܬܐ) for his death? Why should blame serve as a pretext to confine him? This was surely unnecessary. But on the other hand, if man was created immortal, how could death conquer him? and why harness him with the yoke of death because he had sinned yet allow Satan who deceived him to live on? Jacob, as Alwan suggests[131] is probably addressing himself to Narsai when declaring: "It is a great wickedness that this should enter the mind, that with pretexts (ܥܠ̈ܬܐ) He expelled Adam from Paradise! And as blasphemy I consider this: that one should think that what happened to Adam was as was decreed (ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܓܙܪܬ) or as determined (ܐܟ ܦܣܝܩܐ ܗܘܬ) by the Maker".[132] God could hardly have blamed Adam if He had predetermined that which would happen.

---

[129] Gignoux, IV, 406–411. Narsai agrees with Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 50,17–24) that Cain's repentance came too late and could not avert the punishment. Ephrem, however, gives no reason for the extensive length of Cain's punishment.

[130] Alwan, *Jacques*.

Both the commandment and Adam's composition demonstrate that he was at liberty to choose life or death. Had he been victorious the soul would have attracted the body to life. But because the lowly one succumbed and inclined towards death, the heavy body pulled the light soul downwards with it. Adam learned about his own structure and understood that he was the foundation of all beings, mortal and immortal. He was instructed, moreover, through Abel and Enoch that within his race were both life-force and bitter death. Abel's death, in which Adam saw his own mortality, terrified him but through Enoch he knew that immortality was within reach. Like Ephrem and unlike Narsai, Jacob asserts that Enoch's translation not only instructed but also rebuked Adam and chastised him. For had he kept the commandment he would not have died; and had he been pleasing he would not have become mortal. Jacob applies an argument *a fortiori*: if a shoot of the tree pleased God, would the root not have done so had it so desired? If the branch's life was prolonged forever, would not the stem have endured had it preserved the commandment? Concluding his arguments, Jacob calls upon Enoch and Elijah to testify that man will live not only in the soul but in the body as well. For they were created of the same dust as Adam and Abel and not another.

Having established that God created Adam neither mortal nor immortal and thereby refuting Narsai's opinion, Jacob has yet to explain why God forbade Adam to eat of the tree. An answer may be found in Hom. III "On Adam's expulsion from Paradise".[133] Like Narsai, Jacob compares the keeping of the law to a mentor (ܡܪ̈ܒܝܢܐ), for without commandments there can be no preserving of the commandments and without limits, that which is proper remains unknown. Like Ephrem he says that without combat there is neither victory nor crown for the athlete and God wanted man to win. Yet the commandment was

---

[131] Alwan, *Jacques*, transl., p. 23, II, note to st. 117-118.. Alwan's references to Narsai are not the most relevant. Better are Gignoux, III, 330-331.366-367; IV, 75.79-80.216.292-295.

[132] Alwan, *Jacques*, II, 117-122.

[133] Alwan, *Jacques*, III, esp. 189-198.

not difficult to keep and it was easy for Adam to either live or die.[134] Had God wished to enforce hardships upon him, he would not have allowed him all trees and prohibited one alone.[135] What next follows would seem to be related to Narsai's objections to those who attribute the powers of discernment and death to the trees.[136] The tree itself did not kill Adam, Jacob explains, for solely the Divine Essence and not a tree or its fruits has the power to kill. Adam opposed his Fashioner and transgressed the commandment and was consequently attacked by death, a case of cause and effect.

The measures of Divine justice and grace as found in Ephrem's works are equally significant for Jacob of Sarug. Adam and Eve were allowed in just fashion to individually choose life or death. Thus after Eve ate from the tree her nakedness was not immediately made apparent. Only when Adam opted for the same choice so that they were jointly defeated was their nakedness visible.[137] Ephrem's commentary supplements this information, adding that Eve's nakedness, had it been visible, would have shocked Adam whereby he would refrain from eating from the tree in fear and not out of love for God. His test would then have been no test at all.[138]

After the fall, God's mercy or grace constantly intervened to mitigate circumstances. Thus God made His footsteps and then His voice heard in order to induce Adam and Eve to repent. When this failed, interrogation was prolonged and judgment delayed. Compassion and love interceded at the punishment and consolation tempered suffering. Finally the two were expelled in justice but God clothed their nakedness in grace. Their clothing, says Jacob, was tailor-made, created out of nothing by none other than the Maker himself. This proves that God wished them to return to Paradise. Were this not the case, God would simply have cast them out naked and deprived them of his love.[139] Merciful beyond this was the expulsion itself, which prevented Adam and Eve from eating of the tree of life and living forever in rebellion.

Jacob's homilies on Elijah[140] repeat the notion of achieved perfection serving to chastise the imperfect. Elijah's perfection through righteousness and chastity briefly noted in Ephrem's hymns, is elaborated upon in the homily "On the Holy

---

[134] Alwan, *Jacques*, III, 175.

[135] Compare Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 30,7-13 and 35,7-11).

[136] Gignoux, II, 371-376.

[137] Alwan, *Jacques*, III, 555-556.

[138] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 38,16-22).

[139] Alwan, *Jacques*, I, 231-238; III, 1017-1039.

[140] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 133-260.

Prophet Elijah and on His Ascension to Heaven".[141] Elijah was chaste, fled from the world to be near God and avoided all physical delights, writes Jacob. For this reason the serpent's advice never reached his ears. Mention of the serpent inevitably calls Adam and Eve to mind whereby Elijah's behavior is perceived by the reader as being antithetical to theirs. This intuitive deduction on the reader's part is reenforced by Jacob's claim that Elijah never looked at the tree which gives death or transgressed a commandment. Therefore he did not die but rose up beyond heaven on high and mixed with the angels.[142] Had he had one blemish or felt one earthly desire he would have remained on earth. But he was so unspeakably glorious in abstinence (ܩܕܝܫܘܬܐ)[143] and virginity that scripture needs to refrain from relating this. He was so familiar with God that he became a shrine for Divinity and holiness served in him.[144] He showed the resurrection of the dead on earth already prior to his ascension by reviving the child, having battled against death and overpowered it in order to snatch its prey. This he achieved because death is easily vanquished by perfection. Because of his increasing level of excellence God wished to grant him the crown of immortal life which Adam had failed to win. Elijah's humility kept him from revealing the mystery of his ascension and so he merely said that God had sent him on a mission.[145] This was no evasion but the truth. His disciple Elisha understood that Elijah could grant much and would not refuse and so he asked accordingly.[146] What would happen to Elijah was then revealed so that he was glorified. He crossed the river as if it were dry land, depicting the symbol of the great chasm which would be placed between the righteous and the unrighteous at the judgement. The good would cross into the kingdom without being restrained by the rivers of fire while the wicked would remain behind. Upon crossing Elijah left famish, thirst, sleep and bodily faculties behind and became impassible and immortal.[147] He rose up in a bridal chamber of fire upon a chariot of flames while demons wailed and feared him.[148] Death wondered at his escape and accused Satan of weakness: "Where are your traps and nets and

---

[141] *Ibid.*, p. 226–260.

[142] Cf. *ibid.*, V, p. 20 where Abel is raised up among the angels.

[143] *Ibid.*, IV, p. 235.

[144] This terminology is commonly used for Christ.

[145] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 247–248.

[146] *Ibid.*, p. 251–252.

[147] *Ibid.*, p. 251–253.

[148] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

sharp arrows?"[149] Elijah defeated the two robbers who had fallen upon man and brought them into Sheol while the angels rejoiced.[150] They received Elijah and were amazed that their companion was corporeal. "Come in peace" they said, "second witness who comes to make known that if Adam had not sinned in Eden he wouldn't have died. Come in peace, for through you the Adamite creation learns that if it had not fallen away from God it would have lived among us".[151]

Elijah not only chastised Adam but was a type of Christ as well. The typology is not based on ascension and immortality but on sin and escape from sin. In Jacob's homily "On Elijah's Flight from Jezebel"[152] sin is personified by Jezebel and Adam's offspring is embodied in all the prophets whom she killed.[153] At the same time Jezebel, who erred and caused Ahab to join her in her fall, represents Eve who was responsible for Adam's fall. Elijah alone escaped Jezebel just as the Son alone conquered sin. In all things Elijah resembled his fellow prophets except that he was not killed. So too the Son of God resembled man in all things except for sin which failed to rule over him.[154] The two homilies clearly emphasize Elijah's praiseworthiness rather than his ascension. The same is true for Ephrem's hymns where, aside from the few references to Elijah's ascension along with Enoch, Elijah is chiefly presented as one who was steadfast in faith. His fast, along with that of Noah, Moses and Christ, serves as an example of steadfastness.[155]

That this excellent behavior is most important and, once more, a rebuke for Adam, is manifested finally in Jacob's prose homilies for the festivals. He writes in Hom. III "On the Fast"[156] that from eating came the fall and from fasting, the resurrection. Had Adam not eaten, he would not have fallen. The typological reversal is complete for "Adam's combat was renewed in our Lord's temptation. On his (Adam's) behalf He (Christ) clasped the loins of His enemy to do battle. And because of this He made use of a fast against the archon so that the haughty one be defeated in the end by that very cause by which he conquered in the beginning. He therefore descended to combat, not that he conquer but rather to show how it would have been fitting for Adam to conquer."[157]

---

[149] *Ibid.*, p. 256. Dialogues between death and sin, death and man or death and Satan concerning Enoch, Elijah and Christ's escape from death are popular in Syriac literature. Cf. Beck, *CNis.* XXXVI and LXVIII; McLeod, IV, 31–138 and Brock, *Soghyāthā*, nos. 14–17, p. 66–79.

[150] *Ibid.*, p. 258–259.

[151] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

[152] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 133–153, esp. p. 133–137.

[153] *Ibid.*, p. 134–135.

[154] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[155] Beck, *Ieiun.* IV,11; VII,1.12; IX,13.

[156] Rilliet, *Homélies festales*, p. 568–585.

3.9 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem

Jacob of Sarug's writings as presented above reflect the following ideas found in the works of Ephrem: 1) Adam was created neither mortal nor immortal. As such he was free and able to choose between good and evil, life and death. 2) In His dealings with man, God combines the measures of justice and grace whereby the latter tempers the former. After the transgression, for example, God offered Adam multiple opportunities for repentance. Even after the expulsion the punishment was lightened and Adam consoled by the prospect of return. 3) Righteousness is defined as the leading of a chaste and ascetic life. Elijah avoided temptations, was chaste and free of sin. Consequently, he did not die but lived on in the body. He then, like Enoch, serves to chastise Adam who would have lived had he not transgressed the commandment. 4) Elijah is a type of Christ in that he was constant, fasted and did not sin. Christ's history is a reversal of Adam and Eve's and as such He also chastises man who rarely meets his full moral potential.

Where Ephrem's ideas clash with those of Narsai and Jacob's follow Ephrem, Jacob's ideas will obviously conflict with Narsai's as well. Jacob, however, does not limit himself to reiterating Ephrem's arguments. He openly opposes concepts of the Divine Economy expressed by Theodore and his adherents in the Schools of Edessa and Nisibis. These include the notions of man's having been created mortal and the use of wrath not for punishment, but as a means of instruction. It is true that the concept of Divine pedagogics has crept into Jacob's work but it is to a very limited degree and not a decisive factor as is the case for Narsai. Terms as immortality, incorruptibility, and immutability are used by both Narsai and Jacob to describe life after the resurrection, which neither considers to be in Paradise. The notion of the two catastases is, however, foreign to Jacob. Of special interest is the fact that where Narsai shows a fully developed christology, Jacob reiterates Ephrem's emphasis on Christ as man yet avoids explaining how he was man and in what way one can say he was God. In view of the raging christological conflicts of the fifth

---

[157] *Ibid.*, §5-7, p. 568-571.

century, this is curious indeed.[158]

3.10 Enoch and Elijah in the East-Syrian Tradition

3.10.a Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa

Much closer in thought to Narsai than either Ephrem or Jacob of Sarug are Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa. The approach in the first instance will be to compare the works of the latter two with Narsai's homilies. Only in a later phase, when enough evidence has been amassed, will a discussion of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia as their possible common source take place.

Enoch appears several times in Cosmas's books where he plays a role in the long history of God's Economy as transmitted both through the seed of men, in which is the mystery of Christ, and in revelations and types. The parallels between sections of Cosmas's Book V[159] and Narsai's homily 2 "On Revelations"[160] are striking. As in the latter, Elijah also appears but is not treated jointly with Enoch. His history follows a digression on the four messianic psalms and precedes Jonah and the other minor prophets.[161] In Book VI[162] Abel, Enoch and Elijah are mentioned together as part of a list of biblical events cited as proof of the two catastases.

Death, says Cosmas, came upon man not on account of God's wrath but because of His wise Economy: God wanted men to hate sin and pursue justice. If this is not so, Cosmas asks, why should Enoch have been preserved alive? Why did he not die along with the rest? Enoch escaped death and was translated because he had faith (Heb. 11,5) and was pleasing (Gen. 5,24; Heb. 11,5). He demonstrates that God is able to preserve man alive until, through Christ, death will lose its power over men. According to church tradition, says Cosmas, Enoch, along with Elijah, will oppose the Antichrist in the lastdays and confound his errors.[163]

Elijah, in ascending to heaven, shows angels and men how much human nature is honored. He was the first to traverse heaven and through him hope was reestablished of men entering heaven. God's economy is great because in wisdom and not in wrath He punishes men and honors him who was created in His image. Elijah was preserved alive to oppose the Antichrist and cause all who were captured by the Seducer to return to God.

---

[158] For Jacob's credo see Jansma, "The Credo of Jacob", "Encore le credo", "Christologie Jakobs".

[159] Cosmas, V, 59, 61, 79, 82-84 (Wolska, II, p. 95-97, 121, and 125-127).

[160] See above, chapter 2.

[161] Cosmas, V, 140-141, 159 (Wolska, II, p. 203-205; 241).

[162] Cosmas, VI, 19-20 (Wolska, III, p. 35-37).

[163] So too Narsai in Hom. 34 (Mingana, I, p. 313-327), Hom. 51 (Vatican, Syriac 594, fol. 45r-52r) and Hom. 52 (Mingana, II, p. 1-28). For the role of Elijah at the end of time cf. Gignoux, "Doctrines eschatologiques", part 1, p. 337-344.

A better condition is attested to by: 1) Abel's crying out after death, desirous of returning to life. 2) Enoch's translation while alive without having seen death. 3) Elijah's ascension in a chariot of fire with great honor. 4)The power of resurrecting the dead demonstrated by Christ. 5) Christ's ascension to heaven indicating the ascension to the celestial future condition prepared since the founding of the world.

Cosmas's themes are familiar: through God's Economy death came upon man and in this very same Economy He offered him hope through Enoch and Elijah who were translated. These two, moreover, along with Abel point to a better condition to which all will migrate in the end. The correspondences with Narsai's homilies on the creation and Hom. I "On Enoch and Elijah" are clear. The reader remains ignorant however, of both Enoch's location after translation and Elijah's dwelling place after ascension. One should recall that Elijah, according to Narsai, went to Paradise and not to heaven whereas Cosmas clearly states that he traversed heaven.[164]

In Cyrus of Edessa's *Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts*,[165] Enoch and Elijah are once presented as figures or types of Christ. As such they are evaluated positively, but their limitations when compared to Christ, are noted. Had Christ not truly died, we would still be in sin, says Cyrus,[166] and He alone would benefit by reaching immortal life without death. For such was the case of Enoch and Elijah who, on account of the general Economy, escaped death yet benefited none other than themselves. Macomber rightly explains Cyrus's meaning – that if Christ had not died, there would be "no clear indication that death would ever be abolished".[167] Here a distinction is being made between the hope of immortal life which Enoch and Elijah provided by not dying and the abolishment of death which only Christ could provide by his own death and resurrection.[168]

---

[164] Cosmas, V, 140 (Wolska, II, p. 203) writes in one instance that Elijah walked in heaven with the angels, showing that the route of men and angels is one. In the next section (V, 141; Wolska, II, p. 205) he says that Elijah was elevated as if into heaven (ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν). It is thus not clear if Elijah actually entered heaven.

[165] Macomber, *Cyrus*.

[166] Cyrus, "Explanation of the Passion", III§9, p. 77-78.

[167] Cyrus, transl., p. 67,n.6.

[168] A parallel to this passage (which has not been noted by Macomber) may be found in one of the few extant comments made by Theodore on the subject of Enoch and Elijah.

That Enoch and Elijah are nonetheless important for having exemplified resurrection from the dead, is logically more evident in the "Explanation of the Resurrection"[169] than in the "Explanation of the Passion". In the former God is said to have planned everything in advance before it came into being. He knew that He was going to renew the world and this He showed symbolically (ܐܝܟ ܕܒܐܪܙܐ ܡܩܕܡ) in the legal dispensation beforehand, that it not be considered as a new thought or sign of regret on God's part. The first disclosure was in the vengeance of Abel's blood, a vague sign that human nature was going to be redeemed and return to life. This life is not the life which was removed because of the transgression, but perpetual life. Because the bond of creation was undone and the creation plunged into mourning, hope and consolation were needed. God next translated Enoch so that expectation would not only be given metaphorically (ܒܝܕ ܦܠܐܬܐ) but in deed (ܒܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ). He translated him while he was still mutable (ܬܫܢܝܬ ܡܢ ܠܚܠܦܘܬܐ) to teach men by his being preserved alive that death would come to an end.

When God wished the more to provide hope, He brought about Elijah's ascension which was better known by the means employed. Through Elijah it was manifest that man would not only become immortal and immutable but would also dwell in heaven. This has already been effectuated through Christ who has made men ascend with him. For Christ is the true exemplar of these types which are guides and but "shadows of the good things to come and not the substance of the things themselves" (Heb. 10,1). Christ has made men impassible and beyond need, having been adopted as sons through grace and even dwelling in heaven through hope.

Finally, Enoch and Elijah figure once more with regard to Christ's ascension.[170] His ascension was depicted beforehand, as in an portrait (ܨܘܪܬܐ ܡܩܕܡ) in Enoch's translation and Elijah's ascension. Abel and Enoch gave hope to the angels, who considered their labor in vain, that men would become immortal and immutable. Elijah disclosed that men were going to be raised on high and this has been fulfilled in Christ. Elijah, says Cyrus, did not ascend to heaven but towards heaven. He was taken up in a whirlwind "as it were towards

---

Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 244,6-15) has Christ say: "because I followed the precise way of life and redeemed the debt due ... and was in no way worthy of death, I won't be translated like Elijah and Enoch and the advantage won't be mine alone. I accept death, not by force as one worthy of it, rather I do judgment with he who brings death".

[169] Cyrus, "Explanation of the Resurrection", VII, p. 118-120.

[170] Cyrus, "Explanation of the Ascension", V§6-7, p. 153-154.

heaven".[171] For none ascended to heaven except Christ who descended from heaven (Jn. 3,13).

Cyrus's ideas are even closer to Narsai's than those of Cosmas. All three recount the angels' sadness at man's fall, leading them to consider their labor vain.[172] Cyrus, like Narsai, relates that God's revelations become clearer in later generations so that Abel's blood was but a vague inference, Enoch's translation a clearer sign of immortality and Elijah's ascension an indication not only of immortality but of the second catastasis in heaven. The use of the terms guide and type for Enoch and Elijah and present participation through Christ within the greater context of a Divine Economy aiming at the goal of man's renewal in heaven in the second state, all point to a common source having been used by Narsai, Cosmas and Cyrus.

3.10.b Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išo'dad of Merv

The works of the anonymous author of Diyarbakır 22,[173] Theodore bar Koni[174] and Išo'dad[175] repeat several of the themes common to Narsai, Cosmas and Cyrus. All three explain that the reason for the translations of Enoch and Elijah was in order to assure men that at one time all will become immortal and immutable and to rebuke the Evil One. Diyarbakır, followed by Išo'dad, adds that the translations also comforted the angels who thought their labor in vain. Like Narsai and Cyrus, all three later exegetes describe Elijah's translation as having taken place more openly than Enoch's and believe that the events were meant to incite men to virtuous conduct. Interesting is that the "doctors" are quoted as saying that Enoch and Elijah went to the vicinity of Eden. They then entered Paradise with the robber's soul when Christ breached the barrier which had been erected after the fall. None of our exegetes quotes Narsai but surely his opinions as expressed in Hom. I are reflected in the words of "the doctors". This may mean that the opinion of a particular exegete became

---

[171] Macomber, Cyrus, transl., p. 136,n.2, notes that Cyrus's quote of 2 K. 2,1 adds the words "towards heaven" not found in either LXX or Pesh. "As it were" is found in LXX only. On this basis, Macomber presumes that Theodore is Cyrus's source. The link made to Jn. 3,13, a proof text for Christ's humanity, would seem to me to be additional evidence. Narsai too (Hom. I, st. 318), says that "it was thought that he was being raised up on high".

[172] This is an allusion to Rom. 8,20 which is cited by Theodore and most East-Syrian exegetes in connection with the fall.

[173] Diyarb., p. 52,7-26.

[174] Theod. b. Koni, p. 90,9-91,17.

[175] Išo'dad, p. 108,23-110,2.

anonymous or was transmitted in the name of the "tradition of the school" or "doctors" in the course of its having become commonplace. Despite the general acceptance of Enoch and Elijah's whereabouts after their translations, no consensus seems to have been reached as to whether the two met in the body and under what circumstances they were maintained alive. The sources are content with presenting the various opinions and possibilities. Išo'dad alone quotes Narsai in saying that the two met and conversed with the angels.

It would appear that the themes found in the works of the East-Syrian exegetes discussed in this section are fairly uniform. The work of Išo'dad, however, is generally different in that two conflicting opinions are often juxtaposed without further comment. Thus Išo'dad alone presents Ephrem's view that Adam lived to see Enoch translated, so that he not think that Enoch too was killed like Abel.[176] It will be recalled that in his hymns, Ephrem says that this served both to rebuke and comfort Adam. The tenor of Ephrem's thoughts in the hymns is that Adam too could have achieved the same state of perfection as Enoch, a notion which is clearly contradictory to the Antiochene concept of man's original mortality and immaturity. This is surely the reason why Ephrem's exegesis on Gen. 5,24 is otherwise markedly absent from the works of our authors. In any case, no one can be said to follow Ephrem in his emphasis on the ascetic lives led by Enoch and Elijah. In fact, Theodore bar Koni[177] followed by Išo'dad[178] seem to oppose Ephrem when saying that of the two who were translated, "one was married and the other a virgin, in order for us to know that when the two (states, i.e. married and unmarried) are pure (i.e. lived in proper fashion), they lead to beneficence". One may thus conclude that the East-Syrian traditions concerning the translations of Enoch and Elijah are very much in line with Antiochene theology. The main source of our authors seems to have been one and the same, although it is clear that each consulted this source separately. The selections made are the personal choices of the authors and this is equally true for the wording with which the texts are reproduced.

---

[176] Išo'dad, p. 108,9-10.

[177] Theod. b. Koni, p. 90,14-15.

[178] Išo'dad, p. 109,5-7.

Chapter Four
From Enoch to Babel: History Repeated

4.1 From Enoch to Babel

The first important period in the history of mankind is that of the twenty generations from Adam to Abram.[1] The first man was created in the image of the Creator and the life-force which was placed in him was transmitted from one righteous man to the next until it came to rest in the haven of Abraham's love.[2] With Abraham, the realm of the workings of the Divine Economy widened from the level of the individual to that of the people and the peoples. It was from the people that Christ, the true image of God, would descend and the salvation brought about through Him would extend to all of humanity. But what of the generations from Adam until Abraham? We have seen that with the ascension of Enoch (Gen. 5,24) the disrupted harmony of creation brought about by the transgression in Eden was restored and hope was procured. This hope of a future world in which men would become immortal and incorruptible lasted for ten generations until Noah. At the end of this period, however, a turn for the worse takes place. The Sethites and Cainites, those who had been separated on account of the murder of Abel, joined, forming a misalliance the product of which was evil and corruption. Neither expulsion, as in the case of Adam and Eve, nor banishment as was Cain's lot, was deemed sufficient by God to uproot evil and mass destruction ensued. One alone, Noah, was worthy of being saved and he and his family, like Enoch, were transferred to a better place. In Noah, as in Enoch, the life-force was transmitted and he passed it on to his children by means of the blessings and curses. Hope was thus procured once more, this time in a manner less obscure than in the translation of Enoch. Yet while mankind could be said to have progressed, men had still not learned to accept the limitations of their own nature and trust in God. They united once more in rebellion, aspiring to reach the heights and remove God from His lofty dwelling place. Once more they were disbanded, their separation and dispersion (or expulsion) from Babel leading to peace. It was Abraham who first realized the greatness of God's love for His creation and reciprocated this love selflessly.

Because the biblical history of mankind from Noah to Abraham is a

---

[1] Cf. Hom. I, st. 165-168.
[2] Hom. I, st. 153-154.

repetition of the events which took place from Adam to Noah, albeit on a larger scale with greater heights and lower depths, it would seem appropriate to present Narsai's homilies on this period together. Hom. II "On the Flood", Hom. III "On the Blessings which Noah Gave His Sons" and Hom. IV "On the Tower of Babel and the Division of Tongues"[3] cover the biblical events from Gen. 5,28 - 11,9 in which Noah plays a central role. We have seen in the previous two chapters that the interrelation between God and man in the generations from Adam to Enoch as expressed in Narsai's homilies on creation and Hom. I "On Enoch and Elijah" can best be compared to that between a teacher and his pupils. This is wholly other than Ephrem's vision of the same period which is not surprising in view of their opinions on man's mortality at creation and subsequent moral potential. Whether or not this difference is maintained in the next episodes of human history remains to be seen.

4.2 The Flood of Iniquity and the Flood of Justice: Anger and Compassion at Work (Homily II)

Hom. II "On the Flood" commences, as do so many of Narsai's homilies, with the creation.[4] The story of creation followed by a brief survey of history up to the generation of the flood serve as no mere recapitulation of events. For the creation represents the revelation of God's heretofore undisclosed Force and Hiddenness. Having created a perfect world according to His perfect Knowledge, God showed His love in man more than in all things. For man was created in God's image, serving as the bond of the universe and thereby teaching rational beings about God's ineffable Hiddenness. Thus the fashioning is not only the beginning but the key to understanding God's Economy. But God not only loves His fashionings (ܪܚܶܡ ܠܬܘܩܢ̈ܘܗܝ), He is also a lover of justice (ܪܚܶܡ ܟܐܢܘܬܐ ܗܘ).[5] This He showed in the sentences with which He chastised Adam's transgression and rejected Cain. However, God displays a unique combination of love and justice for although He rebukes He welcomes back those who repent. His judgment (ܓܙܪ ܕܝܢܐ) and threat (ܠܘܚܡܐ) are not mere punishment but educative means. They show that God hates iniquity and sin while prodding and drawing (ܢܓܕ) men towards knowledge and proper behavior. God confirms that it is sin He hates and not man's nature, by comforting man with revelations. Through Enoch who was pleasing He turned men towards His love and promised abrogation of death and unending life. This pattern of events – revelation/love, transgression, judgment, comfort/hope/(through) revelation – established for the first time at creation, is destined to be repeated until man's redemption.

---

[3] Homilies 71, 67 and 68 respectively.
[4] See chapters 2 and 3 above and Hom. I.
[5] Hom. II, st. 34-36.

For Narsai the aforesaid pattern is especially evident in the history of the generations prior to Abraham. Whereas comfort prevailed in Hom. I, in Hom. II it is not hope but justice, anger and threat on the one hand and compassion and love on the other which are the key elements. The hope newly won by Enoch's translation had but brief effect, for in acting iniquitously men drove God from compassion (ܪ̈ܚܡܐ) to anger (ܪܘܓܙܐ).[6] The terms employed for the turn of events parallel those describing the flood, portending its horror. Antonyms or negations juxtapose and contrast Noah's demeanor to that of his contemporaries. Commencing with stichs 73–74, we are told that "In Enoch He (*God*) stayed His justice and transformed His anger to tranquility". This tranquility (ܢܝܚܐ) hints at the name Noah (ܢܘܚ) which itself signifies rest or one who brings relief and/or comfort.[7] The hint, however, remains but a hint while evil abounds like the waters of the sea. The wickedness of desires (ܪ̈ܓܝܓܬܐ)[8] whets God's sword for revenge but in fact the earth was already flooded by sin prior to the flood brought by Justice.[9] Just as the inundation would confound (ܒܠܒܠ) nature,[10] so men and women abandoned the ways of nature, ceasing to desire their own spouses and lusting after others. Prolonging the metaphor, Narsai writes that the "flood of sin grew, the tide of iniquity was like the sea, the gloom of error spread and covered the inhabited world and the rays of the light of the eye dimmed".[11] The sinners were sunk in the sleep of iniquity[12] and one alone remained awake: Noah. His faculties were awake (ܥܝ̈ܪܝܢ) and served him as oars[13] even before he entered the ark. While the others defiled their bodies (ܛܢܦܐ ܦܓܪ̈ܐ), Noah purified his soul (ܕܟܝ ܢܦܫܗ). The mud of iniquity didn't trouble him; he stumbled not in the gloom. The wings of his faculties bore him above the waves of sin,[14] as the ark would be borne above the waters

---

6 Hom. II, st. 72.

7 For the implications of the name Noah, see Hom. II, transl., st. 200,n.41.

8 Hom. II, st. 75. The desires (f.pl.) may also allude to the desirable ones (f.pl.), i.e. ܒ̈ܢܬ ܐܢܫܐ, of Gen. 6,2.

9 Hom. II, st. 76–80.

10 A reference to the flood as unnatural and perhaps to the confounding of tongues later.

11 Hom. II, st. 93–100.

12 *Ibid*., st. 101. Narsai often writes of senses sunk in sleep but the expression is perhaps most apt here.

13 *Ibid*., st. 111.

(Gen. 8,17–18). Because Noah had remained lucid, he was deemed worthy of revelations disclosing God's intention of purging the earth of the stain of evil and filth with a flood.

It is only at this point that Narsai specifies that the description above qualifies the behavior of the sons of Seth who mixed with the daughters of Cain. Like Ephrem[15] and many exegetes of the Antiochene tradition, both Greek and Syriac,[16] Narsai identifies the sons of God (ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܠܗܝܡ) and the daughters of men (ܒ̈ܢܬ ܐܢܫܐ) of Gen. 6,2 with the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain. The beauty of the latter opened the source of sin so that the sons of righteous Seth were inundated. They became drunk, their lucid minds troubled[17] by the flood of desire, and they descended from the height of the periphery of Paradise to there where Cain was banished.[18] The results of their union are the giants of Gen. 6,4 whom Narsai characterizes as giants of iniquity and not stature. As sin ascended, Justice was made to descend. Although God Himself said that He regretted having made man (Gen. 6,6), it was the regret of the sinners for which He hoped, seeing that He is omniscient and as such not subject to regret. He therefore made a threat-filled voice heard, announcing the nearing of the end. He also addressed Noah a second time, instructing him to build an ark. Although God could have saved Noah without an ark, the latter served several purposes. First, God taught Noah to provide for himself when commanding him to bring a symbolic quantity of food into the ark. This recalls God's instructing Elijah to eat and not fast, teaching him to provide for himself in as much as mortals are dependent upon food.[19] Second, the construction of the ark was meant to reprove the wicked and lead them to repent. Although mute, irrational wood cried out, instructing rational beings, Noah alone heard.

While his contemporaries mocked him, Noah gathered the animals into the ark. The subjugation of the animals to Noah and the harmony which existed between wild and tame recalls at once Adam's naming of the species. The sovereignty over the animals which Adam lost in transgressing was restored to Noah. But the future, the peaceable kingdom of Isaiah 11, as well as the past is recalled. Moreover, the unity (ܐܘܝܘܬܐ) of the divided species (ܦܠ̈ܓܐ)

---

14 *Ibid*., st. 113–120.

15 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 53,29 – 54,22).

16 See, for example, Išo'dad, p. 111,28–112,11 and 114,1 and Diyarb., p. 54,4–13. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 68,n.20.

17 This would happen to Noah later although in innocence.

18 So Ephrem, Išo'dad and Diyarb., *ibid*.

19 See above chapter 3.3, p. 48.

contrasts shrilly with a more immanent future: that of the unity of men in building the tower of Babel leading to division.[20] Further reference to the past may be found in the seven day limit set before the coming of the flood (Gen. 7,4). The protraction of time, as during the seven days of creation, was meant for instruction. After having called out for one hundred years plus seven days, Grace (ܛܝܒܘܬܐ) was withheld by the wall of justice (ܫܘܪܐ ܕܟܐܢܘܬܐ).[21] The gates of compassion (ܪ̈ܚܡܐ) were closed off while the gate of the waters collected above the firmament was breached. The downpour which followed was inordinate and the world was shaken and filled with darkness. The serenity (ܫܦܝܘܬܐ) of the waters, unlike Noah, was troubled by the iniquity and those from below rose up to meet those descending from above like envoys of Justice. A frightening sketch of the drowning multitudes who are reaped like darnel, felled like a vineyard and trampled upon by the waters as by a winepress, may be found in st. 409–484.

While the sea was tossing, the ark sailed peacefully, waves bowing before it.[22] This was because the Commandment – its captain, the Hint – its sailor, the Will – its star, and Grace as the wind in its sails, didn't navigate it into the turbulence but guided it into the peaceful harbor. After one hundred and fifty days, Justice sheathed its sword and the sign of Compassion was seen atop a mountain. The Hint went forth as a messenger, bearing a letter of peace from Compassion to Anger and the ark concluded its voyage on the mountains of Qardu.

Although Narsai has warned the reader that "it was not regret which overtook the Possessor of the sum of all knowledge",[23] the tenor of Hom. II is that God's justice, anger and wrath alternate with His compassion or love in His dealings with mankind. At the conclusion of the flood, however, the writer informs us that what next occurs is what God had intended all along: to transfer mortals to the middle of the earth, to the wide open spaces. The flood occasioned or was the means of (ܥܠܬ ܠܫܘܢܝܐ) the move, but it was not out of regret that God cast them on the other side of the sea; nor was it in wrath that He expelled them from the vicinity of Paradise. For God knew all

---

[20] Hom. IV, st. 77–80.

[21] Hom. II, st. 337–338. This may be an allusion to the wall of fire (ܫܘܪܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ) which barred Adam and Eve from Paradise (Hom. I, st. 30).

[22] This situation is the opposite of that of Jonah as described by Narsai in Hom. 14 (Mingana, I, p. 137–138) where the seas were calm everywhere, tossing and shaking Jonah's boat only.

[23] Hom. II, st. 183–186.

this in advance and revealed it by various means or (seeming) causes (ܥ̈ܠܠܬܐ) for the instruction of mortality.[24] Similarly, God knew that iniquity would corrupt and death undo His fashioning. Although men would sin, God did not despise His creation. This is why He preserved a remnant of that very fashioning. Just as at the expulsion from Paradise,[25] God showed both His justice and His love. For had He not punished Adam and the corrupt generations, they would think Him a lover of iniquity. On the other hand, in order that men not think Him cruel, God showed compassion. Both justice and compassion attest not to God's weakness but to His force.

Having explained the workings of God's Economy, Narsai returns to the events of Genesis. After the greedy raven was sent forth but failed to return, Noah chose a dove, lover of peace,[26] as envoy. The dove bore an olive branch – tidings (ܣܒܪܬܐ) of peace[27] – to Noah as a pledge of reconciliation (ܪܗܒܘܢܐ ܕܬܪܥܘܬܐ).[28] The Judge's wrath had subsided, for Compassion had intervened and appeased Him, Grace having induced Him to open the door of the ark. Noah was consoled and God told the prisoners to "go out and be consoled by the sight of the land".[29] They had been buried by Justice on the seventeenth of Iyar and on the twenty seventh Grace resurrected them (ܢܚܡܬ ܐܢܘܢ).[30]

A rather odd passage follows in which the loveliness of the month of Iyar is extolled.[31] A brief parallel is drawn between the exodus from Egypt in Nisan and that from the ark in Iyar! In Nisan creatures were renewed by Christ at the time when they were fashioned originally.[32] The implication is that through Noah too, life was renewed and this is confirmed by his offering of firstfruits[33] after departing from the ark. His offering, unlike Cain's, was one of will and was therefore accepted by the Being who is in need of nothing. Once more, He who is never angered subsided (ܐܬܬܢܝܚ) from the wrath of His anger.[34] God promised to return the seasons to the earth and harness all species to the yoke of man, thereby restoring the situation of Paradise. Additionally, He allowed men to eat meat, imposing upon them a new law by means of which (ܒܥܠܬ ܡܛܠܐ ܕܚܝܘܬܐ) He warned them against killing.[35] Beyond these God entered a covenant with Noah, promising to never again to wipe out mankind by means of a flood. Although the rainbow, sign of peace and consolation (ܬܒܝܐܘܢ) already existed, men had never seen it. This seems to reflect the conflict between the belief that nothing new was created after the seven days of creation and the notion that a covenant needs to entail something new. Narsai himself says that the law concerning the shedding of the blood of animals was new, otherwise there would have been no renewal of covenant.[36] So cursory is Narsai's treatment of the sign of the rainbow that one is led to expect a more expansive treatment elsewhere. This is indeed the case, for Hom. III "On the Tower of Babel" commences with this sign of God's promise. This may be an argument in favor of the theory that Narsai wrote Hom. I, II, III and IV as the sequel to the homilies on creation.[37]

---

[24] Hom. II, st. 569–630.

[25] At the expulsion, Adam and Eve were deprived of their seemly dwelling place but were allowed to live in the vicinity of Paradise. God clothed them, teaching them to provide for themselves, and taught them to hate sin.

[26] The contrast made between the raven and the dove here is usually drawn by Antiochene and East-Syrian exegetes at Gen. 15,9 between the fledgling and dove of Abraham's offering. So Theodore (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 186) and Narsai himself in Hom. 2 (Mingana, I, p. 32). Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 96,n.15.

[27] The term ܣܒܪܬܐ may have christological overtones. Cf. Beck, *Virg*. VI,36 and Kronholm, *Motifs*, p 196–198.

[28] Cf. Hom. I where, in similar fashion, Enoch and Elijah were pledges and repositories of peace.

[29] Hom. II, st. 667 and 681. The consolation (ܐܬܒܝܐܘ) refers to the explanation offered by Lamech of Noah's name in Pesh. Gen. 5,29: ܗܢܐ ܢܒܝܐܢ.

[30] References to Jonah, Christ, the future resurrection and life in the second fashioning may all be found here. Is ܢܚܡܬ (resurrected) perhaps a play on MT ינחמנו (Pesh. ܢܒܝܐܢ) of Gen. 5,29?

[31] Hom. II, st. 713–740.

Hom. II concludes with Noah's drunkenness and the curse imposed on Ham. Better said, Narsai closes with words of praise for God's omniscience, just as he began. All-knowing as He is, God noted Noah's error along with his triumph as a warning against excessive drinking. Likewise Ham's servitude is a rebuke of

---

[32] For Nisan as the month of creation see McLeod, I, 199-202 and V, 355-358 and Theodore (Jansma, p. 74, fol. 21r,20-28 and 21v,2-8) who links the time of creation to the exodus from the ark. Cf. Hom. II, transl., st. 740,n.153 for other events associated with Nisan. This passage may echo the "dispute of the months" as does Ephrem, Beck, *Resurr.* IV. Cf. Brock, "Months".

[33] Hom. II, st. 743. The mention of firstfruits with "to offer" probably alludes to Christ. The link between creation in spring and and the renewal of the world through Christ in the spring may be found in Eusebius (Hovhannessian, p. 15). Theodore (Jansma, *ibid.*) compares the first Nisan of creation to the Nisan when the earth dried. In the latter a second fashioning has taken place through Noah, the counterpart of Adam and Eve. No mention, however, is made here to Christ.

[34] Here it is Noah who brings relief and God who is relieved.

[35] Hom. II, st. 793-794.

[36] Hom. II. st. 789-792.

[37] See above, ch. 1.2.a for a discussion of Jansma's theory on the order of Narsai's homilies.

both impudence and the thought that slavery belongs to the order of nature. Moreover, God's foresight is the reason for His concealing the ark, eliminating thereby the likelihood of man's worshipping it as God. Here too, "knowing our evil inclination, He checks us by various means (ܒܝܕ ܥ̈ܠܠܬܐ)".[38]

Conclusion

Like Hom. I, Hom. II presents the flood narrative as an attestation of Divine prescience and Economy. Having created the world according to His plans, God revealed His love and even His Hiddenness to His fashionings. The punishments issued against Adam (expulsion from Paradise and being cast into its lower regions) and Noah's generation (expulsion from the vicinity of Paradise and being cast into the middle of the earth) were not the punishments of transgression but the means to effectuate God's plans (ܒܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ). At the same time they instruct man to hate iniquity.

Unlike Hom. I, the theme of hope makes way for the interplay of Divine justice and compassion. Although this pair is similar to that of threat (ܠܘܚܡܐ) and grace (ܛܝܒܘܬܐ) previously encountered in the homilies on creation, the two are not identical. The concept of wrath restrained by grace alternates in Hom. II with that of God's pedagogical Economy, within which threat and punishment are not merely just deserves, but means to preplanned ends. The notion of a creation so wicked that only grace can save it from deserved punishment does not seem compatible with the concept of man's inborn imperfection. Whereas we have claimed for the homilies on creation and Hom. I that the Antiochene elements predominate, forming a homogenous whole, this can not be said of Hom. II. Further investigation of Narsai's sources will perhaps help elucidate the disharmony felt in the homily in question here.

4.3 A Blessed Curse (Homily III)

There is no doubt that man, according to Narsai, was created mortal.[39] Yet within his very limbs is hidden the mystery or symbol (ܐܪܙܐ) of his liberation and the repository of life. This mystery is sometimes hidden and sometimes revealed, according to God's will and the ability of men to understand. Homily III "On Noah's Blessings", is about the symbol hidden in Noah's blessings, the meaning of which was not even truly revealed to Noah himself. The occurrence of the terms life (ܚܝ̈ܐ), life-force (ܚܝܘܬܐ) and repository of life (ܣܝܡܬ ܚܝ̈ܐ) at both the beginning and end of the homily and their frequency throughout it, parallels the flow of the life-force – which was and will be a source of immortal life – from Adam through Noah. In the beginning God gave life to mortality through the force of His very life-force.[40] Sin, however, effaced the name of life-force from the image and noted corruption in his name and death in his limbs.[41] Nevertheless, this life-force was seen, however dimly, in Seth, Enoch, Lamech and Noah. Lamech prophesied that through Noah the earth would rest (ܬܢܝܚ) and his purity would purify the earth of its curses.[42] Accordingly, the seasons came once more in their due course after the deluge so that seeds and harvest no longer ceased. Yet the effective relief Noah offered (ܐܢܝܚ) the earth was in the blessings he gave his sons from the treasure of life which had come to rest in him. Anticipating, yet not yet questioning the peculiarity of Noah's blessings, Narsai presents a series of nine distichs, the first commencing with "Blessed is the Creator" and the others following with "Blessed is He" (st. 41–58). In these benedictions Noah surveys the events of his life as made possible by God. He begins with what is about to happen – the blessing of his sons – and looks backward to commemorate his having been made the second Adam through whom a second creation (ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܬܢܝܢܐ) was fashioned. Like the first image, Noah too received hegemony over the creatures.[43] He returns to the present, or more precisely to the future, in blessing Shem. This blessing, like the nine preceding distichs, opens with the words "Blessed is the Lord God", followed by "of Shem" (st. 63). He then procedes to bless his remaining sons: he asks God to amplify Japheth[44] and cause him to dwell in the tent of Shem while making Ham his brothers' servant (st. 71–74). But how these expressions qualify as either blessings or curses is difficult to understand, says Narsai. For not Shem but God was blessed, and not Ham was cursed but Canaan (st. 85–88)! Surely one must look into the hidden meaning of the words of one who took such license as to exchange good and evil as only God can do (st. 93–120).

---

[38] Hom. II, st. 895-896.

[39] See above, ch. 2 and 3.

The repository of life which was hidden in Noah is none other than Christ, albeit symbolically (st. 137–146). In understanding Japheth as the subject of the ambiguous "may he dwell in the tents of Shem" (st. 71), Narsai lays the

---

[40] McLeod, II, 17–18.

[41] *Ibid.*, 29–30.

[42] Cf. Gen. 5,29.

[43] Gen. 9,2. Cf. Hom. II, st. 291–294 and 765–768.

[44] The Pesh., like MT, makes use of a word play on the name Japheth: ܢܦܬܐ ܠܝܦܬ.

foundations for his further interpretation. Both Japheth, dwelling in Shem's tents and Ham who was subjugated to his two brothers, were made dependent upon the eldest (sr. 141–142.195–196).[45] Noah honored Shem not because he was the eldest and so naturally deserved to be honored, rather he honored Him who would renew nature (st. 149–150). The mystery (ܐܪܙܐ) with which the homily opened is thus disclosed to the reader as well as to Noah. For it is Christ the Life-giver who "submerged (ܛܒܥ.)[46] Himself in Sheol – a dead sea, acquiring life-force for the dead waters".[47] While Noah breached the fence of wrath which was set between God and His fashionings,[48] Christ breached the wall which death had built before the dead and prepared the way for mortality towards life (ܠܚܝܘܬܐ).[49] Wondering at the life of his child, it was the Life-giver at whom Noah wondered and for this reason he blessed God, including his son in the blessing of Him whose name is blessing (st. 183–186).[50] He blessed his own son in whom the Lord and His Son were hidden and yoked the other sons to him. If this is not so, Narsai exclaims, what meaning have the blessing and the curse? Why didn't Noah bless Japheth independently? And when were the curses ever effectuated? Neither the Canaanites nor the Egyptians, Ham's offspring, ever served Israel. To the contrary! The events contradict those things which were spoken (st. 197–222). It seems momentarily as if there is no solution to this riddle. The contradiction is, however, only apparent for the words agree with the true reality. Yet understanding is required because the words are veiled (st. 225–234). God could have revealed His love directly but this would have been to no avail, for men were as yet unable to benefit from it. This is why Noah saw the shadow of the truth, the symbol prior to the reality (st. 245–254). His words too were hints to his sons, that the one expand (ܢܦܬܐ) his mind to partake of the wealth flowing from Shem and the other bow the shoulder of impudence in order to serve the life in his brother (st. 261–268).

---

[45] The subject of "may he dwell in the tents of Shem" (Gen. 9,27) is usually thought to be God. Diodore (Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 158–159) however, sees Japheth as the subject of prophetic words, i.e. Japheth will rule over Media instead of Shem. Gennadius (*ibid.*, no. 160) offers two explanations: either Japheth is included in Shem's blessings, or God will dwell in Shem's tents so that the latter received the majority of the blessing. The first explanation may derive from Theodore. For the relationship of Gennadius to Theodore cf. Van Rompay, "Gennadius", p. 400–405.

[46] The implication is perhaps that Christ not only submerged but baptized Himself in Sheol.

[47] McLeod, IV, 139–140.

[48] Hom. III, st. 47.

[49] McLeod, VI, 283–284.

[50] The name Shem itself means name of God, according to Narsai, Hom. III, st. 97.

The importance of Ham and Japheth's dependence upon Shem goes beyond the particular. The former two represent the peoples of the earth who will come to serve Christ. As such Noah's blessings are of universal significance. Paraphrasing Paul, "Every slave is a freeman redeemed from youth; and the freeman too is a servant of the Lord Christ",[51] Narsai explains that some need forcibly to be yoked to freedom while others, in freedom or love, receive freedom (st. 307–314). This is in essence the history of the house of Abraham, for both Abraham and Isaac blessed the one son and subjugated the other. Moreover, Esau, like Ham, never served his brother Jacob (st. 317–334). It is clear that the forefathers depicted that which they did not know, revealing the unrevealed through the revealed (st. 339–344). Like Enoch, it is hope which they received, acquiring hope to proclaim hope (st. 349–354).

Hom. II concludes with a survey of God's revelations from Adam until Noah. By means of the wisdom of truth implanted in mankind, God instructed each generation according to its maturity. Making Adam a witness to Eve's creation, God led Adam to understand that He created the world. Abel, by means of this wisdom, loved the Lord and demonstrated his love. Enoch learned to be pleasing and so became immortal. Lamech prophesied that Noah would relieve (ܡܢܝܚ) the earth and remove the mourning (ܡܥܒܪ ܐܒܠܐ) of man's sadness.[52] Noah proclaimed the renewal of man, transmitting the life–force to his sons. It will continue to be passed down until the end of time according to God's love and will which He reveals secretly and openly.

Conclusion

As in Hom. I, the number of biblical verses which serve as a point of departure in Hom. III are few.[53] Both Enoch's translation and Noah's blessings were heard symbolically (ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ) and their true meaning remained hidden. Not even Noah himself understood the full force of his words. The two men provided consolation in various ways. Enoch consoled the heavenly beings who mourned Adam's fall and ceased all activities on his behalf. By gaining immortality, Enoch showed them that their labor was not in vain. Moreover, he pacified men, serving as a deposit of peace while acquiring hope for many generations. Noah's very name includes the elements of repose and comfort.

---

[51] Gal. 3,28; Rom. 6,22.

[52] Once more the explanation of Noah's name is based on a combination of two hebrew roots: נוח (rest) and נחם (comfort).

[53] Hom. I is based on Gen. 5,(22–)24 and III on Gen. 9,25–27.

Noah, like Enoch, was not troubled by the turbulent waves of desire which customarily beleager men. While the creation was wearying itself and men labored in iniquity, Noah was a haven of peace. God saved a remnant through him and after the flood the seasons and harvest were restored. The curse which had been placed upon the earth instead of upon Adam was revoked. The earth was thus relieved and men comforted. Yet the true meaning of the relief and consolation which Noah offered is the renewal of life. This is not the replenishing of the species on earth but the condition of immortality and incorruptibility. In that state the angels' activities will cease, for there will be no need for the changing of the seasons and the provision of food. It is the second catastasis at which both Enoch and Noah hint, the latter more openly than the former.

Because God is omniscient, He provides instruction and hope according to man's needs. Man's immaturity was the reason why the means and circumstances of Enoch's translation remained hidden. Elijah's translation, on the other hand, was disclosed to the prophets beforehand and witnessed by Elisha, Elijah's disciple. Nonetheless, these ascensions, like Noah's blessings, are considered as shadows (ܛܠܠ̈ܐ), types (ܛܘܦ̈ܣܐ), reflections (ܐܝܟ ܡܚܙܝܬܐ) and semblances (ܕܘܡ̈ܝܐ) of the truth (ܫܪܪܐ) or true reality (ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ).[54]

The thoughts expressed in Hom. III, like those of Hom. II, appear to be internally consistent. Moreover, the two homilies are complementary, developing the theme of God's pedagogical Economy. The centrality of Noah's blessings and the specific interpretation attributed them by Narsai are in all likelihood due to the importance of the aforesaid theme. This interpretation is echoed later in East–Syrian exegesis and may reflect the Antiochene tradition.[55]

4.4 Rebellion in Union and Peace in Division (Homily IV)

Had Hom. III "On Noah's Blessings" not been handed down along with Hom. II "On the Flood" and IV "On the Tower of Babel", the reader would not only not be perturbed but might, in fact, not even notice its absence. It will be recalled that Hom. II concluded with the safe concealment of the ark. The bible links the flood narrative to that of the tower of Babel by means of an extensive list of the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth. Narsai connects the two by recapitulating the flood story at the beginning of the homily on Babel in the form of a Divine monologue addressed in hidden fashion to Noah and his sons through the rainbow. The resumption of the metaphors of Hom. II calls to the mind of the reader not only the contours of the homily on the flood, but the dramatic details as well.

---

[54] For further discussion of these terms see ch. 5 below.

[55] For similar explanations of Noah's blessings, see Diyarb., p. 64,6–26, Išoʻdad, p. 129,5–26 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,2–22 and 4.12 below.

Beginning in st. 1 with the sign of peace which God gave to man, a contrast is quickly drawn in st. 2 with the terror of the flood which destroyed man. A series of contrasting pairs follows in st. 3–10: a covenant of love vs. anger and chastisement with water (st. 2–4); God's love for those of His household vs. His hate of iniquity (st. 5–8); God is both harsh and gentle, chastising and retaining or forgiving (st. 9–10). The bow itself embodies a contradiction, for it is unstrung and without a hand to stretch it (st. 13–14). The bow is both a sign of dread and of love, for with the bow of His will, God shot arrows of water at the iniquitous at the time of the flood (st. 15–28). By means of the waves He reaped the field of thorns (st. 29–30). Yet it is He who preserved Noah alive in dead wood, acting as a sailor, navigating and conducting the ark into the harbor of peace (st. 32–41). Men are acquainted with both God's justice and grace and know that God loves man. Yet if provoked, God will show His anger (st. 45–48).

Alas, peace was but of short duration and just as men forgot the pledge of hope given through Enoch, so too they forgot the sign given to Noah (st. 61–68). With desire for land (ܒܪܓܬ ܐܪܥܐ)[56] they departed from Qardu (st. 69–76), just as the sons of Seth had descended from the vicinity of Paradise in fleshly desire (ܒܪܓܬ ܦܓܪܐ)[57] and earthly occupations (ܒܥܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ).[58] United in tongue and thought, they arrived in Babel where they were seized by the desire of labor and iniquity (st. 77–80). Like Adam, it was Divine rank which they coveted and, thinking to become Gods, they sought to raise up an iniquitous stronghold (or rebellion)[59] against God (st. 81–88). They now were the ones to shoot arrows of pride at truth,[60] thinking to capture height and deep (st. 91–96). The preposterous nature of their undertaking is made clear here, for it was precisely the coordinated effort of the waters of the height and the deep which brought about the destruction of mankind. The allusion to the flood is intensified in st. 101–102, where desire is said to burn in the thoughts of the inhabitants as it did in those of the sons of Seth. Their senses sunk in sleep and their inclination aroused, they left off serving God and voluntarily undertook immeasurable labor. Like the labor which was involuntary and necessary before the flood when the seasons no longer functioned, it was without benefit.

Lacking faith in God and fearing another flood, the people commenced building a tower. Narsai enumerates three motives for this activity: 1) they would be saved from another flood, should it come about; 2) they wanted to engage in battle on high against the Creator and 3) having won, establish the vainglorious name of victors on earth. Additional reasons are voiced in a series of distichs (st. 135–149) commencing with the cohortative "Come, let us" (ܬܘ), followed by a verb in the imperfect third person plural, precursors of God's ܬܘ in Gen. 11,6. These reasons include revenge for the merciless destruction of the human race, God's indictment for killing irrational beings, and the appropriation of God's rank and sovereignty. In agreeing to unite so as not be scattered, the wicked prophesied about the future, seeing what would be while not seeing.[61] Moreover, they wrote out and signed their own indictment as had Adam and Eve. God, compassionate and merciful, saw that they labored in vain and stopped them by conveying voices of love and threat. In the form (ܒܐܣܟܝܡ) of anger and wrath, God made His voice heard, as He had done for Adam and the generation of the flood, and relieved them (ܐܢܝܚܢ) from a flood (st. 194–207).

In a sequence of six distichs (st. 210–221) setting forth from Gen. 11,6 and introduced by the exclamation "Lo!" (ܗܐ), God first summarizes man's impudent plans.[62] Another series of five distichs follows (st. 222–231) in which the initial word is "Come" (ܬܘ). God asks His counsellors to descend to earth together (ܫܘܝܐܝܬ) without migration (ܕܠܐ ܫܘܢܝܐ) in order to contest without hands against fleshly beings. They would snatch the sword of the word in which men took pride, diversify their tongues and divide them. Narsai is amazed at God's words (st. 231–279) and notes that only at the creation did He say equally, "Come, let us make" (Gen. 1,26).[63] Both here and there did He call upon His counsellors and they are the ones who made and divided men. These counsellors are none other than the Son and the Spirit, called by the Father. Man's importance is hereby established without doubt, for in him alone hidden things were revealed – the hypostases which are hidden with God. If this is not so, Narsai challenges, to whom else would God similarly address Himself? Surely not to the angels! For to them He would have said, "Go, descend" as to subordinates and not "Come with me, let us make" or "Come with me, let us descend". This argument supplements the discussion of Gen. 1,26 in the creation homilies. There Narsai argues that "Let us make man according to our image and our likeness" reveals the three hypostases in one Divine Being (ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܚܕܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܐ),[64] the Son and the Spirit having created all things together (ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ) with the Father. "In our image" and "according to our likeness" are the distinction of the hypostases and the equality of their nature respectively.[65] In addition, Hom. 5 "On the Blessed Mary" opens with an explanation of Gen. 1,26: "Let us make man" is the mystery of the manifestation of the hypostases which, when heard by the angels, caused them to marvel.[66] "To whom does God call for help, or with whom does He take counsel?" they asked. It seems that God has others with Him; and if not, why did He say ܬܘ and not ܬܐ? Thus Gen. 1,26 indicates that God spoke to not one but more; to partners and not to servants. Moreover the Trinity entails a distinction of hypostases but an equality of nature. While the mystery was expressed in both instances in hidden fashion, it would be made explicit at the gift of tongues (Acts 2).

---

[56] Perhaps "earthly desire" is being alluded to as well.

[57] Hom. II, st. 81.

[58] Hom. II, st. 138. This expression may also lead one to think of "occupation with women".

[59] The Syriac (ܡܪܕܐ) implies both.

[60] ܩܘܫܬܐ, truth leading to association with ܩܫܬܐ, the bow.

[61] Noah too, Hom. III, st. 107-110, prophesied about the future, seeing yet not seeing or perceiving what the mystery was.

[62] After "Lo", a different term for men is used in each pair, i.e. men, sons of Adam, mortals and earthly beings.

[63] The verb "come" is not to be found in the biblical text of Gen. 1,26 but is added by Narsai both here and in his homilies on creation, Gignoux, I, 118.125; III, 265. So too Diyarb., p. 68,21-23. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 88,n.8

God's descent poses the next problem (st. 322–329). Thrice Narsai affirms without further explanation that the descent was without migration (ܕܠܐ ܫܘܢܝܐ),[67] accomplished swiftly by the Hint. This clearly contrasts with Enoch and Elijah's ascents which are called translation or ܫܘܢܝܐ. Narsai may have sufficed by saying that in making God the subject of a "descent", Moses spoke in the language of men when describing Divine activity. The fact that he makes use of the term "translation" or "migration" (ܫܘܢܝܐ) demands further explanation. Perhaps a reference is being made here to the Gospel of John. In Hom. 81 "On the Word Became Flesh and Abided in Us", the Word is said to have been always with the Father, just as the word is of the soul and with it.

---

[64] Gignoux, I, 115–156 esp. 133–136.

[65] Gignoux, III, 263–264. So too Theodore (Sachau, p. 22,11–2).

[66] Ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 26v.

[67] Hom. IV, st. 226.274.280.

The Son was with the Father and went to the world and was still with Him. For just as the word never departs (ܫܡܬ) from the soul, so the Son never departs from His Begetter, thereby distancing Himself from Him through migration (ܐܪܚܩ ܡܢܗ ܒܫܘܢܝܐ). The word of the mouth departs to all corners yet doesn't migrate from the soul's side. The "Word too journeyed from the Father and went to our mortal dwelling place and while He dwelled in our nature, He was entirely in His Father".[68]

From the questions surrounding the mystery of the Trinity, Narsai moves on to question the manner in which the one original language was divided into many (st. 290–399). At the creation of man God put the life-force into dead clay and the soul played upon the strings of the body so that it sung melodies of the living spirit.[69] Similarly, here He caused the soul to sing new songs. The frustration experienced by mankind at the division is well-captured in the description of the gestures made by the members of the various nations.[70] Although to them, and perhaps to the reader as well, it seems that God intended to punish the iniquitous, Narsai reiterates (st. 392–459) that God meant only to frighten men, showing them His dislike of iniquity. He divided them in order to dispel iniquity according to His plans readied from the very beginning. It was neither a new thought nor wrath which urged Him to descend, as history attests. Adam He taught to fight against enticements; through the flood He wished to check man's wild behavior; Canaan was cursed so that he not mock his father and here God descended to pacify man yet again. He expelled man both from Paradise and from Babel in order to bring peace or cultivate (ܕܥܡܢ) the earth. The dispersion was to prevent more sin and bloodshed and the very Hint which descended, accompanied each individual to his dwelling place. God instructed men both in their new language and in how to set up societal laws. Because of the resulting peace, the spiritual ones – as in the time of Enoch – once more acquired hope. A pledge of life was mixed in the division, just as it was in Noah's blessings *and* curse, for the symbol of tongues to be given the apostles was depicted in it. Just as Enoch and Elijah's ascents and Noah's blessings were to prevent future events from seeming strange to those who would experience them, so too God prepared the manifestation of the hypostases of the Son and the Spirit in the division of tongues. The wrath here parallels the revelation of the Divine Force in the fire at Pentecost and all know that all events, the former and the latter, are of God.

---

[68] Hom. 81, ms. British Library, Oriental 5463, fol. 340r–340v. Cf. McLeod, I, 67–96.

[69] McLeod, II, 17–22.

[70] Their failure to understand each other is the antithesis of that which was to occur at Pentecost (Acts 2).

Conclusion

In Hom. IV the behavior of the generation of the tower parallels that of the generation of the flood and of the first couple. Their wickedness and mistrust contrast sharply with God's ways. These are peace-loving yet warn the iniquitous about the wrath of justice. Despite the lessons of the past, the foolish ones let their pride take hold of them to such an extent that they undertook futile and exhausting labor. The very thing they feared - dispersal - subsequently took place. This dispersal was not mere punishment but an act of mercy in itself. Firstly, it prevented the demise of those laboring uselessly. Secondly, it allowed them greater dwelling space. Thirdly it involved a hint of the Trinity as well as of the revelation of the Trinity to the apostles. This hint was provided in God's words "Come, let us descend" which is the subject of a digression on God's omnipresence and the descent and ascent of the Son of God in John. In this way, men learned of God's sovereignty so that not only the transgression paralleled that at creation, but knowledge of God was acquired in both instances. The wrath and justice with which the homily opens is slowly transformed into the *guise* of wrath, love and compassion. For what seemed to be wrath was the very cause of peace. Thus the events of Gen. 11 fit into the pattern of events established from the beginning, where in His prescience, God used certain means to correct man and accomplish other plans.

One may conclude that in the story of the tower of Babel, Narsai has successfully combined key elements in the theologies of Ephrem and Theodore. The elements of wrath and anger provide the story with drama while arriving at God's true purpose enacted not immediately, but through ways beneficial to man.

4.5 The Balance of Justice and Grace: Ephrem's Commentary on Gen. 1-11

In the preceding chapter a brief discussion of Ephrem's view of man's moral potential was presented. Theoretically, this potential is so great that Adam and Eve could have attained immortality almost instantaneously, i.e. on the very day of their creation. When fashioned, human nature was not deficient, hence its foundations were firm. But beyond this positive basis, the element of free will set in man's nature would and will continue to be the determining factor in the development (or regression) of his moral potential. This element, says Ephrem, whereby "man is sovereign to the extent that he may choose whether to obey

God or not" is what constitutes man's being God's image.[71] However, man does not remain unassisted in making his choice. God is continually with him, showing infinite patience despite man's proclivity towards evil and implementing justice (ܟܐܢܘܬܐ) and grace (ܛܝܒܘܬܐ) alternately when needed. The enactment of justice and intervention of grace may seem contradictory to the notion of Divine prescience. If God knows beforehand that man will sin, why does He have recourse to a recurring display of wrath? This question has been posed by scores of biblical commentators, among them Ephrem. The latter's commentary, especially in the sections commencing with man's creation through those on the generation of the tower of Babel, reflects the tensions inherent to a solution of this contradiction in which justice and grace are not the denial but the outcome of Divine prescience. The following paragraphs will survey the interaction of man and God in the aforesaid sections of Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis* and culminate in a comparison with Narsai's ideas on the same.

The first manifestation of God's prescience and grace is, according to Ephrem, in the blessing addressed to Adam and Eve in Gen. 1,28: "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and rule upon it...".[72] Seeing that the blessing pertained not to Paradise but to the earth, God indicated hereby His knowledge of the imminent transgression and subsequent expulsion. Nevertheless, He placed Adam in Paradise in grace, for it was on his account that Paradise was created. Although it may now seem clear why the blessing preceded the transgression, Ephrem makes a curious addition to his previous remarks: "the blessings might otherwise have been withheld because of the transgression of the one to be blessed and the world come to naught because of him on account of whom all was created".[73] The implication is that not benediction but destruction was rightly deserved, thus the blessings too constitute grace. This is confirmed in the next paragraph of the *Commentary* where Ephrem explains that the blessing blessed in advance by Grace, was intentionally directed at the earth so that the curse it was going to receive from Justice (Gen. 3,18-19) would be tempered.[74] Thus God's justice and grace are personified and oppose each other, undeserved Grace tempering the effects of Justice prior to the foreseen events.

The Paradise story as portrayed by Ephrem is in fact an amassment of evidence proving that man's sinful behavior was unwarranted and thus most clearly undeserving of grace. Having been placed in Paradise, Adam and Eve were permitted to eat of all the trees except one. Their transgression was surely not motivated by hunger but by disregard of the commandment.[75] This disregard was the more unjustified seeing that Adam's hegemony extended over all the animals, as promised, and beyond this he was endowed with the ability to name them all. Yet this superabundance which included being clothed in glory did not restrain him from transgressing.[76] Moreover, if Adam and Eve did not feel love for the commandment, neither did they fear that death with which the tree was enveloped in order to deter them.[77] Should one object that the immaturity of the two made them easy prey to deception, the fact that they were wise enough to name the species, strong enough to work the garden, mature enough to guard the commandment and haughty enough to disobey it proves the contrary.[78] Neither was the snake's shrewdness a force to be contended with, for Adam's shrewdness, derived from human wisdom, surpassed the snake's. He was endowed, moreover, with soul, intellect, glory and a dwelling place superior to the serpent's[79] and was thereby able to rule over the animals.[80] It was none other than man's greed which made him receptive to the serpent, the very greed which would have caused him to eat of the tree even if there had been no seducer.[81]

---

[71] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 23,24-25). Cf. Bou Mansour, "Liberté humaine", esp. p. 255 and 261-264.

[72] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 24,21-31).

[73] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 24,27-31).

[74] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 25,1-8).

Yet if Adam and Eve's greed would have lost the contest against the tree's beauty despite the fact that they felt no hunger, why need there have been a seducer altogether? God, says Ephrem, had given everything to man in grace, gratuitously. Man was, however, not granted immortality, having been created neither mortal nor immortal.[82] This he was to gain through justice, i.e.

---

[75] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 30,1-13).

[76] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 31,3-22).

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 30,14-17.

[78] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 33,2-9). Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 64,20-25) similarly argues that Canaan was not too young to be cursed because he was not too young to commit the deed worthy of the curse.

[79] According to Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 23,4-14), the animals were created outside of Paradise to serve man after his expulsion.

[80] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 33,13-34,3). Note that the same characteristics which should have led Adam and Eve to guard the commandment (Tonneau, p. 31,20-22) comprise their superiority over the snake.

[81] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 34,11-21). Ephrem's indictment is so extreme here that Bou Mansour, "Liberté humaine", p. 267, must surely be mistaken in thinking that Ephrem was "tempted to attenuate the guilt of the first couple in view of their inexperience".

[82] See above, ch.3.

deservedly, by freely choosing to obey (or disobey) the commandment. For this reason God hid the tree of life, that the two not keep the commandment – which could hardly be considered a commandment, seeing that it pertained to one tree only – in view of the reward.[83] By not disclosing the tree, moreover, God spared the two the double temptation of the seductive beauty of two trees.[84] Thus a seducer was needed and the snake adopted this role. Yet the snake came as it was, endlessly disgusting and void of signs and wonders, so that it certainly could serve no one as a pretext.[85] Furthermore, it came quickly, when Adam and Eve were not yet hungry and had not as yet been tempted by the tree.[86] It's arrival also followed immediately upon the giving of the commandment, so that no doubt would remain as to its purpose.[87] And if this were not enough, the snake's words should surely have betrayed him. For his words, "you shall not die... but your eyes will be opened" (Gen. 3,4-5) were both contrary to God's words and blatantly untrue. For Eve's eyes were already open, yet she failed to use her discernment and reply appropriately.[88] The tree enticed her, more than did the snake, to pluck its fruit. She desired to eat of it and beyond this, to become divine and dominate Adam. Thus, even when the snake's promise failed to materialize, she persuaded her husband to eat.[89] In order that Adam be tested in like fashion, Eve's nakedness was not revealed to him. He was to keep the commandment in love or awe of God, but not on account of the shock of her exposure. He too failed the test.[90]

In summary, Adam and Eve were well equipped with faculties to see through the snake's wiles and outsmart him. Moreover, the circumstances of his arrival – in haste, directly after the commandment – were favorable for the couple's resistance. That Adam and Eve failed was due to their greed which was present despite an absence of hunger. Their grasping nature included the wish of both to become divine and Eve's desire to dominate Adam who was created to rule over her. God, on the other hand, had made the test facile not only in His choice of the deceiver but by the limited parameters of the commandent. Aside from the tree of knowledge and the tree of life, He had placed all other trees at the disposal of the pair. The temptation was reduced the more by God's having kept one tree out of sight and prohibiting them from drawing near to the other. Eve transgressed despite all the factors which should have aided her and went on to lead Adam astray. Adam too stumbled, after having been justly and equally tested.

---

[83] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 34,22-35,11). Apparently keeping a commandment in view of reward is considered keeping it for an ulterior motive while doing so out of fear, is not viewed as such.

[84] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 35,1-2).

[85] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 35,12-26).

[86] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 36,1-5). According to Ephrem, Eve's words to the serpent in Gen. 3,2-4 indicate that not only were Adam and Eve prohibited from eating of the tree but from drawing near it as well. Thus they had been warned away from the one and unable to see the other, as it was secreted.

[87] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 36,12-16).

[88] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 37,7-15). Cf. Beck, *Eccl.* XLVI,10 and XLVIII,3.

[89] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 38,3-14).

[90] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 38,16-22).

Eating of the fruit, however, was not the last instance in which man exposed himself despite God's succor. In an effort to assist man and limit the harm resulting from the the transgression to the loss of knowledge and immortality, God delayed His arrival, allowing Adam and Eve the opportunity to repent.[91] However, the counterbalancing of justice by grace in the form of mercy which the Judge could have been moved to display had He been supplicated, failed to occur. No regret nor even confession was uttered by the transgressors despite God's delay and the sounding of His footsteps and His voice for their benefit.[92] Superfluously they recounted the events to the Omniscient One as that which had *overcome* them, shifting the blame from the one to the other instead of appealing to His mercy.[93] After questioning those who, though able to repent failed to do so, God pronounced the sentences. He commenced with the snake because it had instigated transgression and in so doing, He offered Adam and Eve still another chance to repent and be spared Justice by Grace. But they didn't relent and were punished and expelled.[94] Even the expulsion was an act of justice and mercy, for had Adam remained in Paradise, he'd surely have eaten of the tree of life. The death sentence would subsequently be annulled and eternal, pain-filled life granted. Thus in order to keep the sentence intact - a sentence both just and merciful, promising an end to torture - without negating the life-giving property of the tree, the two were cast out of Paradise.[95]

Unfortunately, the history of transgression was to repeat itself all too soon. Cain, like his parents, neglected to use the power of discernment with which he

---

[91] Whereas the snake arrived quickly, God delayed coming, says Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 39,25-31).

[92] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 40,3-9).

[93] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 40,23-28; p. 41,28-42,17).

[94] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 43,10-16).

[95] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 46,4-23).

was endowed, and made an offering to God with disregard.[96] God rejected this offering in order to show that He knew Cain's intent (or lack thereof) for it is this, or man himself, which interests God and not offerings for which He has no love.[97] Instead of repenting, Cain was angered and even after having been warned that sin was awaiting the first opportunity (Gen. 4,7), he did not better himself.[98] The supplications or renewed offering remained wanting and Cain offered his brother instead. His wickedness was compounded by his lie to his parents about Abel's whereabouts and the fact that his concern was solely about others ridiculing him.[99] God, unlike Cain, appeared not in wrath but in mildness (ܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ), offering Cain the choice of repenting or receiving the deserved punishment.[100] As He'd done in Paradise, God questioned Cain as if ignorant, Justice having estranged itself, as it were, from its own knowledge.[101] Having refused, like Adam and Eve, to confess even his own actions, Cain was cursed as they were. His curse, like theirs, was apposite: Adam who did not keep the commandment so as to enjoy life without labor, would have to toil in sweat for his own nourishment. Cain who was haughty, would shake and tremble.[102]

---

[96] Bou Mansour, "Liberté humaine", p. 268, explains that according to Ephrem, bad habit is liberty become nature and "that which takes place without discernment is either the result of habit or of chance which is not rooted in the thought of him who acts" (cf. Beck, "Ephraems Brief"). Thus Cain's behavior may be understood as either the first step or perhaps even the result of a process whereby he surrendered his liberty.

[97] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 48,1-4). Similarly Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,2-5) writes that God smelled not the smell of Noah's sacrifice but saw the purity of him who offered. Cf. Beck, *CH* XXX,1-2.11 where God "eats" yet doesn't eat offerings, being pleased with the repentance signified by them. Comp. *CH* XXXVI,10.13 and *Virg.* XXIX,6-7 where Ephrem accuses the heretics of understanding metaphors literally.

[98] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 48,10-30). Cain, says Ephrem, needed only to have expressed his will. Whether or not God would have then accepted his offering or heeded his supplication is another matter. As Bou Mansour, *art. cit.*, p. 274 elucidates, "It is not repentance which is capable of removing sins, but God who remits them in taking account of our repentance. ... God's grace far exceeds that which human will can accomplish."

[99] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 48,17-24). The description of Cain is paralleled by that of Esau (*ibid.*, p. 86,18-26 and 88,5-10). The latter has no regard for his birthright, holding it in such contempt as to sell it impetuously for soup. Having lost his blessings, Esau wailed, not because of the spiritual loss but on account of his having been deprived (like Cain!) of the good crops of the blessed earth. Similarly, he was saddened, not because he could not be justified or inherit eternal life, but because he could neither subjugate his brother (as Cain had attempted) nor inherit Canaan. In short, he longed for the material and not the spiritual. His envy was in fact so great that, like jealous Cain, he wished to kill his brother.

[100] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 49,22-28).

[101] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 50,6-9).

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 50,11-16.

Struck immediately by the curse, Cain could as yet have asked for postponement of the punishment so that he might placate Justice. But this he failed to do. The words, "My trespass is too great to be forgiven" (Gen. 4,13) may not be understood as regret, for they were uttered only after he'd been cursed. He could not be forgiven, nor could his wish to die[103] be accommodated, for the sentence needed to be executed. Death which served to mitigate Adam and Eve's punishment, was not granted here. To the contrary! Cain's humiliation - the reason for his death wish - was increased seven-fold. Moreover, the unexpected addition of a sign to the punishment worsened matters.[104] The unpromised increment to Adam's blessings in Paradise[105] finds its (negative) counterpart here, just as Adam's expulsion is paralleled by Cain's exile. The latter, however, is voluntary[106] and as such an indication of the severity of the punishment. There where Cain dwelt, he worked the earth, as did Adam, but for Cain the earth refused to yield its force (Gen. 4,12).

The reason for Cain's voluntary departure to Nod, Ephrem explains, was his brother Seth's refusal to join the two families in marriage on account of Cain's shame. Seth and his offspring would, in fact, have liked to wreak the vengeance of Abel's blood but were stayed by Cain's sign.[107] Yet the preservation of the "sons" or "people of the Lord", as the sons of Seth were called,[108] was short-lived. For the house of Cain produced many females[109] and seemed destined to be cut off, leading its members to take drastic measures. The women adorned themselves and captivated the sons of Seth with their beauty.[110] The

---

[103] This is one possible interpretation of "all who find me will kill me" (Gen. 4,14). Another is that Cain asks to be protected from death. Cf. Ephrem, (Tonneau, p. 50,31-51,12).

[104] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 52,7-14).

[105] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 31,7-9).

[106] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 52,17-20).

[107] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 52,18-20; 54,1-3.7-8).

[108] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,29-55,3). Interpreting Gen. 4,26, Ephrem writes that because Seth separated himself from Cain, they (i.e. his offspring) were called by the name of the Lord. He then associates the same with the "sons of God" of Gen. 6,1 (Tonneau, p. 56,1-3). In *HdF* XLVI,8, men, and not angels, are called "sons of God" because man's created nature prevent him from being considered God while the angels, were they so designated, might be wrongly seen as Gods.

[109] These are the daughters of men of Gen. 6,1. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 53,17-20; 56,3-4). In *Parad.* I, following the summary of the history of the expulsion, first from Paradise to its outskirts and from there to Qardu after the flood, Ephrem presents the fall of Seth's sons in greater detail. Cain voluntarily descended to Nod, a place lower than where the "lofty" sons of God lived. The latter in turn descended, taking the daughters of man. Comp. Narsai, Hom. II, st. 145-156.

[110] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,14-16). Cf. *Ieiun.* II,2 where Cain adorns his daughters for the sons of God and Tubalcain and Jubal played musical instruments. The sons of Seth fell

latter were perhaps more easily seduced after the barrier of shame had been torn down by Cain's death at the hands of Lamech.[111] The circumstances of Seth's sons' initial fall might be mitigating but the wickedness which followed was nonetheless cataclysmic.

A state of wantoness ruled as evidenced by the inappropriate choice of partners, e.g. rich by poor and beautiful by ugly. The lewdness extended to those already married so that the infidelity of the men led the women to abandon chastity (ܢܛܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܢܫܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܚܣܢܘܬܐ) until all were corrupt (Gen. 6,12) with the exception of one.[112] Noah alone preserved his virginity (ܒܬܘܠܘܬܐ) for five hundred years,[113] serving as the example of virtue (ܢܘܗܪܐ ܒܗܝܘܬܗ) for the corrupt generation.[114]

Seeing that humanity was solely occupied with matters of the flesh, by the standard of Justice it was not even worthy of a chance to repent. Men's lives would therefore be cut short. Grace interceded, however, as in the cases of Cain and Adam and Eve, allowing them one hundred and twenty years to repent and escape the pending wrath (ܪܘܓܙܐ).[115] This was to no avail, for although the offspring produced by the strange coupling resembled Seth and Enosh physically,[116] it did nothing but evil day and night. Thus sins were accumulated in the years given for repentance.

The threat of destruction was immanent, for God, according to His own words, regretted having made man (Gen. 6,6). Once more the question of God's omniscience is raised. If God knows all in advance, why should He express regret? Ephrem replies that He wished to show that the wickedness of these generations was such that it moved Him who does not regret, to do so. Herewith a twofold purpose was served: 1) Justice vindicated its actions (ܪܘܚܐ

---

and lost their great name.

[111] This is one of the possible explanations of the enigmatic verses Gen. 4,23-24 offered by Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 53,5-54,6).

[112] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,4-21).

[113] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 55,19-23). According to Gen. 5,32, it was not until his five hundredth year that Noah begot Shem, Ham and Japheth. In *HdF*, XLIX,1 Noah's purity tipped the scales in his favor so that the others drowned while he who was chaste and honorable/weighty (ܢܟܦܐ ܘܡܝܩܪܐ) was lifted up in the ark.

[114] Cf. *Eccl.* III,2.9 where Noah also rebukes his generation. For the freedom in them equalled that in Noah and the success of the latter shows that the failure of the others was a question of will. Moreover, repentance may be found in all so that grace and justice undo and war against the sins and faults of the peninent.

[115] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 56,26-31).

[116] They were of the same stature as Seth and unlike the house of Cain which was undernourished, says Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 57,1-20).

ܬܘܒ ܢܦܫ ܥܠ ܐܦܪ̈ ܟܐܢܘܬܐ), showing that it was not gratuitously that it drowned humanity in the flood; 2) the presumptuous ones would be so terrified that they would repent. Should they perish in their deeds, Grace would be pained. Alternatively, should they not perish, other generations would be ruined by their influence.[117]

God's warnings, however, were not limited to expressions of regret. He commanded Noah to build an ark which took one hundred years to complete. During this time, as in the first five hundred years of his life, Noah's righteousness served as an example (ܟܪܘܙܐ ܐܦ ܒܙܕܝܩܘܬܗ), his justice proclaiming the coming flood. For those who remained unconvinced, the miraculous gathering of the animals in the ark, species by species, should have been satisfactorily persuasive. Yet the peaceable kingdom[118] established there was no more than a source of amusement.[119] God's patience was such that He granted them a final delay of seven days. These were so replete with signs that even if the one hundred and twenty years of Gen. 6,3 were reduced to one hundred, the twenty years were more than compensated.[120] Moreover, in the event that the wicked remained unremorseful, they would be spared numerous sins.[121] And the righteous? Ephrem, foreseeing objections, disrupts the logical sequence of his arguments at this point to add that the one hundred years were also granted the righteous, that they bring suit against the sinners before expiring at a ripe age.[122]

The flood which had been postponed in mercy many times, finally came and wiped away all life except for the occupants of the ark. The latter entered singly (ܝܚܝܕܐܝܬ) to preserve chastity (ܒܢܟܦܘܬܐ) in the ark but were brought out paired, that they multiply on earth.[123] Noah made an offering to God who smelled not the sacrifice but the serenity (ܫܦܝܘܬܐ) of Noah's

---

117 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 58,1-24).

118 The description of the gathering of the animals (Tonneau, p. 59,21-60,4) recalls Is. 11.

119 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 59,28-29).

120 According to Gen. 7,6, Noah was six hundred years old upon entering the ark. God addressed him (Gen 6,13) directly after the births of Shem, Ham and Japheth were noted (Gen. 6,10). If Noah was five hundred years old at their birth (Gen. 5,32), only one hundred and not one hundred and twenty years had passed.

121 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,27-30).

122 Thus, says Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,20-22) the cause of their death would be natural, sparing them from the flood.

123 Ephrem's notion (Tonneau, p. 61,22-25) is based on the differing formulations of Gen. 7,7 and 8,16. According to the first Noah entered with his sons followed by his wife and daughters-in-law. Later God commanded Noah to leave the ark with his wife, his sons and his daughters-in-law.

heart[124] and promised not to bring another flood. The reason God made this pledge, Ephrem oddly explains, is lest He efface man yet again, should He heed the daily evil thought of his inclination (Gen. 8,21). This passage finds its parallel in the equally unusual passage discussed above, where God blessed Adam and Eve in Paradise.[125] Knowing they would sin, God blessed them prior to the transgression with a blessing appropriate to the post-Paradisaic situation, lest He withhold the blessings after the transgression. Perhaps the key to both passages is the same: humanity received in grace that which it did not rightly deserve.[126]

Another interesting parallel may be found between Ephrem's remarks on Gen. 1,26 and Gen. 9,4-6. Not only does God make a covenant of resurrection with Noah, Ephrem explains, He also made one of retribution, i.e. he who is murdered will be avenged as was Abel's blood. The reason for the latter is because man was created in God's image. Man as God's image is an expression of man's sovereignty in both Gen. 1,26 and 9,6. Whereas in his commentary on the former, Ephrem writes that man's sovereignty is such (ܕܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܪܟܐ ܫܠܝܛ) that he may choose to obey or disobey God,[127] in the latter he is sovereign (ܕܫܠܝܛ) to let live or die.[128]

It will have been noted thus far that Ephrem, by means of a contrast, stresses both God's patience with humanity and the latter's ungrateful persistence in sinning. Evidence of wickedness beyond that found in the bible is mounted against Adam and Eve, Cain and the antediluvian generations. Ephrem equally elaborates upon the biblical description of the righteous, adding one or more items from his list of good works, i.e. justice, virginity, fasting and abstention from wine.[129] As noted earlier, Abel, Enoch, Noah and later Moses are

---

124 Once more, it is man's intention with which God is concerned and not the offering itself. See above, p. 91-92 for the discussion of Cain.

125 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 24,27-31).

126 While Ephrem's emphasis on God's prescience is surely directed against the Marcionites, the passages remain problematic. Cf. Martikainen, *Böse* and *Gerechtigkeit* for Ephrem's anti-Marcionite polemics.

127 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 23,24-25).

128 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 63,2-4). Cf. Bou Mansour, "Liberté humaine", p. 252-255, who says that liberty is understood by Ephrem as sovereignty (ܫܘܠܛܢܐ), unconstrained by external forces.

129 According to Ephrem, human response is necessary to achieve salvation, aside from the working of grace. Good deeds, i.e., justice, virginity, fasting and abstention from wine will be rewarded (Beck, *Parad.* VII,4-21). It is, therefore, not surprising that Ephrem adds these qualities when they are omitted by scripture in its descriptions of the just. Clearly Noah's drunkenness in Gen. 9,21 poses additional problems for Ephrem in light of the above. Cf. Bou Mansour, *art. cit.*, p. 275-276.

especially noted for their chastity.[130] Thus a seeming lack of chastity calls for additional explanation, as when Ephrem is faced with the forefathers' polygamy or Tamar's and Lot's daughters' pregnancies. He attributes the former to historical circumstances and the latter he says, were mitigated by the ensuing chastity of Lot, his daughters, Judah and Tamar who remained unmarried.[131] Similarly, Noah's inebriation and the cursing of Canaan instead of Ham pose difficulties for Ephrem. He explains that Noah's drunkenness resulted not from the quantity of wine he drank, but from the expanse of time which passed since the "righteous one" last imbibed.[132] Noah's exposure through Ham is covered by Shem and Japheth because they knew his virtue and because he was being guarded by angels both when awake and asleep.[133] Noah, as opposed to Adam and Eve, did not sense his nakedness but did sense what his son had done. He then cursed Canaan, not Ham, either because the latter had already been blessed[134] or because Canaan was the first to see Noah's nakedness and then reported it to his father. In the last case Canaan was justly cursed (ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܬܠܝܛ), for the punishment applied directly to the perpetrator whose maturity, having led him to act, was deserving of such. Ham too was worthy of a curse but escaped malediction so that his innocent offspring would not be cursed along with him.[135] For blessings and curses were indeed passed on. Through their father's blessings, the offspring of Shem and Japheth were blessed.

---

[130] For Moses, who refused to have relations with Zipporah after his encounter with God at the burning bush, see Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 132,21–23 and 133,11–16).

[131] See Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 81,2–7) for Lot's daughters and *idem.* (*ibid.*, p. 98,1–5) for Judah. Hidal, *Interpretatio*, p. 96–98, notes that certain passages are problematic for Ephrem, but nowhere explicitly states the cause of Ephrem's unease or the link between the passages.

[132] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 63,10–64,2). The qualification righteous (*ibid.*, p. 63,24) followed by excellence (*ibid.*, p. 64,2) are surely meant to reenforce the positive, rather than the negative portrayal of Noah in the reader's memory. So too in *Eccl.* XXXIV,6 Noah is said to have cast off neither chastity nor faith and although exposed, he was never debauched. On the other hand, Noah's drunkeness serves as a warning in *Virg.* I,10–11, as it does at the end of Narsai's Hom. IV, st. 853–860: if wine could overcome Noah who was able to conquer the flood, how much the more can drinking vanquish solitary ones and steal their virginity, as Lot's daughters stole the fruit of pregnancy from their father.

[133] The latter calls Jacob the patriarch (Gen. 28) to mind.

[134] Just as the nature of the tree of life did not change so as not to give immortal life so blessings were not changed into curses, says Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 46,18–23). Cf. Isaac's blessing of Jacob and Esau (*ibid.*, p. 87,28–88,4). The one exception is the curse rightly placed upon Reuben by Jacob but undone by Moses. The unusual turn of events leads Ephrem (*ibid.*, p. 118,9–15) to a comparison with the sentence of death decreed upon Adam which was undone by the Son of God through the promise of the resurrection.

[135] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 64,26–65,2).

The latter were manifold in their territory and God dwelled in the tents of Abraham, the descendent of Shem. Canaan's curse was also realized, i.e. in the subjugation of Canaan to Israel after Joshua's conquest.[136]

The final episode of the Genesis narrative prior to Abraham is treated somewhat differently by Ephrem than the earlier events. The builders of the tower of Babel were wicked indeed, as Ephrem proves by rebutting their arguments – two of which he provides them – one by one: if building a city was on account of fear, and raising a tower to escape a flood, then both were superfluous seeing that there was no outside threat and God had given His word that He would never again inundate mankind. "So as not to be scattered", they said (Gen. 11,4) but who was there to scatter them? It was their pride and unity which was behind their activity as expressed in their desire to make a name for themselves.[137] God immediately set about foiling their plans, declaring that they would be punished. Exactly the opposite of their words would take place: they would be scattered.[138] God called to the Son and the Holy Spirit to descend[139] and confuse the tongues as He would at the time of the apostles (Acts 2). Here Ephrem offers no explanation as to why God descended to see the city. Surely He knew what was going on? Moreover, no single opportunity for repentance is offered. Their tongues were confused so that the original language was preserved by one tribe only.[140] Divisions resulted, leading to war[141] until Nimrod finally scattered them all.[142] This he did according to God's will, fighting valiantly in the Lord's battle[143] so that men were distributed among the places accorded each by God. Ephrem neglects to inform us whether this dispersion was an act of justice or grace or both. The omission seems surprising in a text with such affinity to the pattern established thus far.

---

[136] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 65,3–8).

[137] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,1–8). In *CNis.* XLI it is Satan who claims to have erected the tower through the force of the impudent masses.

[138] This is an interpretation of Gen. 11,6. Simon and Levi were likewise divided and scattered when cursed so that the unity (ܐܘܝܘܬܐ) which led to their avenging Dinah's shame without informing their brothers, was lost (Tonneau, p. 112,13–18).

[139] "Come, let us descend" is not addressed to one but two, says Ephrem, (Tonneau, p. 66,13–15) whereas in Gen. 1,26 ("Let us make man") God addresses the Son only (Tonneau, p. 23,17–23). Cf. *HdF* VI where Ephrem explains that the hidden God becomes visible through the Son. It was the Son whom He addressed in "Let us make man" as well as in the other acts of creation and not the thing which was created nor the angels. Had God spoken to the latter, He would have done so clearly, just as He spoke to Cain. Through the first-born, Adam was formed and when he erred, He was called back through Him. In *HdF* LXX we learn that ܬܘ ܢܚܘܬ refers to two, for ܬܐ ܢܚܘܬ is appropriate when addressing one. Moreover, just as the name Babel is real and not metaphorical, referring to the chaos which occurred, so God's names are real, three-fold and ordered (ܒܛܘܟܣܐ).

[140] Cf. *Virg.* XL,11 where God is said to have given the apostles many tongues, for their truth parallels the type which is Babel.

[141] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,20–24).

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 66,28–31.

Odder still is that nowhere else in the continuation of his *Commentary on Genesis and Exodus* does Ephrem evoke an interplay between (personifed) Divine Justice and Grace.[144] Nevertheless the underlying concept of God's continuous patience in the face of man's stubborn refusal to repent, as expressed by the above interplay, is ever present. The story of the destruction of Sodom, for example, closely parallels the flood–tower narrative. God appeared to Abraham, as He had to Noah, to announce the pending judgment of wrath (ܓܙܪ ܕܝܢܐ ܕܪܘܓܙܐ) upon Sodom. He withheld this information from Sarah to spare her grief, but Abraham was to supplicate God. In this way the world would know that not one righteous person remained in Sodom.[145] So too, prior to the flood, God had allowed all the righteous to die naturally so that the righteous were not destroyed. Moreover, supplication would have helped the wicked in both instances. Like the generation of the flood, the Sodomites greatly sinned, and as at Babel, God descended to investigate the situation. The question as to God's knowledge, omitted in Ephrem's commentary on Babel, does appear here. It is not that God didn't know what was happening and so He descended, but rather He distanced himself from His knowledge (ܡܕܥ ܟܠ ܐܬܪܚܩ, ܠܝܕܥܬܗ).[146] This He did as an example for judges that exactment of judgment only take place after thorough investigation, even in open and shut cases.[147] God not only gave the Sodomites a fair chance, He assisted them by sending two angels. Had the Sodomites ceased sinning after this wondrous vision, they may not have been forgiven their earlier sins but they would have averted that horrible sentence.[148] The angels' appearance at night[149] and tarrying outside[150] were additional elements of the Sodomites' test which may have

---

[143] This is an interpretation of Gen. 10,8–10. After dispersing the people, Nimrod himself occupied Babel according to Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 65,17–26).

[144] Although these two Divine attributes or their equivalents (e.g. wrath and compassion) are recurrent throughout Ephrem's hymns, e.g *CNis.* I,6.10–11 and *Resurr.* IV,10.

[145] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 76,14–21).

[146] Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 50,7–9) where Justice asks Cain: ܠܐ ܗܐ ܐܘܪܟܬ, ܠܟ ܕܬܬܘܒ ܠܐ ܐܬܪܚܩܬ, ܠܝܕܥܬܗ ... ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܢܕܘܒܬ ܕܐܘܬܐ.

[147] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 76,24–30).

[148] *Ibid.*, p. 77,8–11. This was the case for Cain as well. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p.48,13–17).

[149] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 77,25–29).

[150] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 77,13–14).

helped them. Unfortunately, like Noah's contemporaries, the Sodomites went rampant, ignoring the proffered signs.

Similarly, the Egyptians and their Pharaoh ignored the many warnings of Moses and Aaron. From the very beginning, when the magicians' staffs were swallowed by Moses's, Pharaoh knew that the first-born of Egypt would be swallowed up. This most severe blow, however, was reserved for the end so that if Pharaoh repent it would not take place. Repentance was encouraged by the other plagues which were less severe.[151] In fact, by announcing each plague beforehand, God made clear that it was not His will to wipe out Egypt.[152] But Pharaoh and his magicians refused to repent. Pharaoh hardened his own heart[153] and the magicians increased the suffering of their own people by increasing instead of diminishing the plagues.[154] In the end, Pharaoh released the Israelites, not because he repented, but because he feared he'd die as had the first-born.[155] And even at the sea God placed darkness between the camps of the Egyptians and the Israelites, that they might repent in fear, and prolonged the drying of the sea – which could have been instantaneous – an entire night that they might repent in awe.[156] Alas, not even the appearance of God Himself, nor the binding of the wheels of the pursuing chariots convinced the Egyptians[157] and so, like both the generation of the flood and the Sodomites, they met their end.

4.6 Narsai and Ephrem

In the beginning, according to Ephrem, God created a perfect creation. The presence of evil in the world was not due to any inherent property of nature but to man's free will. For had the nature of creation itself been evil, God would not have repopulated the world after the flood from a remnant of that very same nature. The power of discernment with which rational beings were endowed was meant to aid them in their choice between good and evil. Moreover, they were granted the advantage of experiencing good first. Despite all these benefits, the period commencing at Paradise and ending with the dispersion of the peoples (Gen. 11) was one of rapid decline characterized by greed, murder, licentiousness and adultery culminating in rebellion against God. The wickedness which was limited at first to few, swelled to include all the inhabitants of the earth with the exception of one. Although the evil ones justly deserved to be sentenced, God, says Ephrem, forestalled judgment time and again so that man might repent. The patience God displayed was supplemented by the many signs pointing the way to repentance. In the face of such grace as highlighted by Ephrem, man's wickedness appears even worse than described in the bible. Were this not sufficient, our author blackens the account further by adding negative elements not found in scripture. We have already met the latter's counterpart in chapter 3, in the exaggerated qualities of undoubting faith and chastity attributed to the righteous in the absence of, or even contrary to scriptural evidence.

---

[151] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 135,21–24).

[152] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 138,10–16).

[153] See for example Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 135,11–12 where) the author stresses, even when the bible attests to the contrary, that not God but the Pharaoh hardened his own heart. Cf. Jansma, "Ephraem on Exodus II".

[154] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 136,1–4).

[155] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 141,31–142,2).

[156] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 143,15–19).

[157] *Ibid.*, l. 24–29.

The interplay of Divine justice and grace was shown to be a - if not *the* - major theme of Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis and Exodus*, whether these attributes were personified or not. The importance of this theme and its connection to the questions evoked by the biblical narrative concerning God's omniscience and man's free, will emerge from Ephrem's hymns as well. One may safely conclude that Ephrem's works are the source of this same theme in Narsai's Hom. II "On the Flood". Present in this same homily yet less emphatically so, is the motif of instruction and hope provided man through Divine Economy familiar to us from Narsai's homilies on creation and Hom. I "On Enoch and Elijah" and generally ascribed to the Antiochene school of exegesis.[158] Herein punishment is not so much an exercise of justice but a means of instruction, for God discloses His plans through various means (ܒܥ̈ܠܠܬܐ). In Hom. IV it becomes clear that a sentence (division of tongues and dispersion of the peoples) is actually a form of love and mercy. By dividing the builders of the tower, God spared them further pain and punishment and granted them peace. For it was not because they built a tower of iniquity that God dispersed them, rather in order to expel iniquity from among them.[159] Thus it was in a *form* (ܐܣܟܝܡܐ) of wrath and with harshness (ܒܩܫܝܘܬܐ) that God distributed His benignity (ܒܣܝܡܘܬܗ). Looking back in time, Narsai discovers God's repeated application of this mechanism: it was by means of or occasioned by (ܒܥܠܬ) the fruit that death entered, teaching men to combat enticements. The flood was caused by (ܒܥܠܬ) iniquity and meant to bridle

---

[158] Cf. e.g. Wickert, *Pauluskom.*, p. 89-101, Greer, *Captain*, p. 202-210, Macina, "L'homme à l'école de Dieu", part 3, p. 39-58, Dewart, *Theology*, p. 23-30.

[159] Hom. IV, st. 410-411.

man's nature. Again, because of iniquity Canaan was cursed so that none mock his father, and for this purpose (ܒܗܕܐ ܥܠܬܗ) God descended: that in the form (ܒܐܣܟܝܡ) of the voice of division, men be pacified.[160] Thus it would seem that the causal linkage of the disclosure of God's predetermined plans (e.g. mortality and the spreading of humanity throughout the world) with iniquity and wrath is a component of Divine pedagogics. That the latter need to be in keeping with human nature is logical and that this is so is implied in Hom. II, st. 618-622. There Narsai writes that God showed justice so that men not think He approves of iniquity, and was compassionate that they not think him cruel. It is men who think in terms of regret, wrath, compassion and cause and effect. This would explain the occurence of anthropomorphisms in the bible. The view of history and Divine pedagogics provided in Hom. IV is supplemented by the consolation and hope offered by Enoch and Noah in Hom. I and III. These two men were instructed by God and acted as guides and guarantees for mankind. As links in the chain of the righteous, they transmitted the life-force and pointed to the mystery which was beyond even their own understanding.

Narsai's homilies dealt with in this chapter and the previous one, i.e. Hom. I-IV, may be said to form a unit because they follow the biblical narrative found in Gen. 5-11 sequentially. Each of the homilies resumes part of the narrative as well as themes found in the preceding homily before moving on to the next event. Within this unit two groups of homilies may be distinguished, the one following the bible more closely (II and IV) and the other dealing with relatively few biblical verses (I and III). Whereas Hom. II and IV may be seen as a synthesis of Ephremic and Antiochene themes, Hom. I and III seem to follow the Antiochene line more closely, presenting Divine Economy through two major figures. The homilies of the first group, however, differ as to the degree in which the themes have been synthesized. For the concepts of justice and grace, when translated into the terms wrath and compassion or threat and love, may merge smoothly with the workings of Divine pedagogics. The flood story (Hom. II) is more problematic than that of the tower of Babel (Hom. IV), for the punishment was neither postponed (as was death for Adam and Eve) nor partial (the people of Babylon were scattered and not destroyed) but immediate and absolute. Of what use was instruction to that generation once destroyed and in what sense was love mingled in the threat? That this biblical story may be understood more readily in terms of justice and grace than predetermined plans and putative cause is not surprising. The combination of themes does, however, seem to give rise to the tension Jansma felt in Narsai's homilies on creation.[161]

---

[160] Hom. IV, st. 420-429.

4.7 Jacob of Sarug's Homily on the Flood

Jacob of Sarug's interpretations of the stories of Gen 6–11 have fortunately been preserved in two homilies, "On the Flood" and "On the Tower of Babel".[162] The first follows the order of the bible, commencing with a description of Noah as the leaven, remnant, leavings of the field and the shoot from which the earth would be enriched and replenished. He alone remained righteous, the one shoot in a corrupt vineyard.[163] The spread of corruption commenced with Cain the iniquitor, whose cursed roots produced weeds.[164] His offspring was iniquitous, produced false testimony, was wanton and promiscuous so that husbands and wives were unfaithful.[165] Having become estranged from the descendants of Seth and Enoch on account of the murder of Abel,[166] these asps descended from the height to the cursed earth below which was barren. Matters worsened when the sons of God mingled with the daughters of men (Gen. 6,2), that is when the sons of Seth, mighty ones, sons of judges (ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܕܝ̈ܢܐ)[167] descended as well and chose women from among Cain's daughters. The sons of Seth were called the sons of God in accordance with Ps. 82,6 ("You are gods, sons of the most high") because they despised adultery. The daughters of Cain were called daughters of men because man implies lowly and deficient as opposed to the elect Sethites.[168] The latter were seduced by the melodies plucked on the instruments newly invented by Jubal for this purpose, and defiled themselves in choosing licentious women.[169] Thus David's words were fulfilled, "Yet truly as men you will die" (Ps. 82,7), because they were wicked and caused iniquity to spread.[170] In an aside, in Ephrem's footsteps[171] Jacob refutes the "Greek" notion

---

[161] See the discussion on Narsai's heritage in chapter 2.6.b above.

[162] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 1–60 and I, p. 1–27 respectively.

[163] Bedjan, *ibid.*, IV, p. 2–3. For the image of the vineyard cf. Is. 5.

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 5

[165] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[166] *Ibid.*, p. 6–7.

[167] The identification of (sons of) judges with (sons of) gods is derived from the juxtaposition of the terms in Ex. 22,27: "You shall not revile god(s) (אלהים) nor curse rulers (נשיא)". Targum Onqelos interprets this verse to refer to humans and translates בני האלהים of Gen. 6,2 with בני רברביא. Ephrem applies the same terms as Jacob (ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ and ܕܝ̈ܢܐ) to the sons of Seth (Tonneau, p. 57,3–20).

[168] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 8.

[169] *Ibid.*, p. 7. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 54,15–18) and Beck, *Ieiun.* II,2.

[170] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

that the sons of God were angels or Satan who coupled with humans. For angels feel no physical desire, and should Satan be able to commit adultery, no virgin would remain on earth! Thus the designation "mighty ones" (ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ) accorded the products of iniquity, refers to their great stature which was like that of Seth and Adam and thus of great repute (ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ ܕܫܡܗ̈ܬܐ).[172]

God, the Just One, seeing that thorns and weeds were produced instead of wheat, became angry and desired to wipe out the earth with a flood.[173] According to the words of Moses "God regretted that He made man and was saddened" (Gen. 6,6). But, Jacob asks, how could the Lord feel regret? If He became sad then He must be as one who is deficient in knowledge and unaware of what will happen. If He is Divine, how can He be brought to new thoughts each day? But no, this is not so, for God is not like man, forgetting one thing and remembering another. Nor does He have new thoughts about measures to be taken or consider first and then act.[174] God's regret and sadness show that evil was so great and widespread that the Impassible One felt pain. The extraordinary choice of words is meet for the extraordinary and excessive behavior of the generation of the flood and obviates any further description of their behavior in the bible. Moreover, in donning the guise of repentance (ܠܒܫ ܦܢܝ ܗܘ), God hoped that the sinners would imitate Him. Yet these metaphorical (or anthropomorphic) words (ܡܠܐ ܫܐܝܠܐ), meant to instil fear and pain in those who heard them, were not effective.[175] Thereupon, God decided to wipe man and animals from the face of the earth.[176] The latter were to perish as well, for if there were to be no possessors, of what use were possessions? Thus God's judgment was just, destroying all.[177]

Noah alone found favor in God's eyes and had there been but one other like him, the building of the world would have been sustained by the two pillars. But one pillar isn't sufficient and so God revealed His plans to Noah with hidden words which spoke to his mind,[178] telling of the coming disaster.[179]

---

[171] Beck, *CH.* XXIX,5,4–6.

[172] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 9–10.

[173] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[174] *Ibid.*, p. 12–14. This remark may be aimed against the LXX translation, "God reflected (ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεὸς) ... and meditated (καὶ διενοήθη).

[175] *Ibid.*, p. 15–16.

[176] Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 58,3–11).

[177] Here (Bedjan, *ibid.*, p. 17) Jacob differs from Ephrem who writes (Tonneau, p. 58,15–21) that God's regret on account of the transgressors extended to include those who had not transgressed.

[178] I.e. God does not literally speak aloud.

Once more Jacob digresses from the events at hand to engage in polemics. This time it is the astrologers and those who believe in fate who are attacked. If the stars determine one's destiny, Jacob argues, it is impossible that all humanity meet its death at once, or all seasons be abolished, for the zodiac signs pertain to a specific time only.[180] It was Justice, before whom the end of the world entered, Jacob explains, thus introducing the theme of justice and grace already familiar to the reader from the works of Ephrem and Narsai. Grace, on the other hand, urged Noah to build an ark, thereby devising a pretext or cause (ܪܟܒܬ ܥܠܬܐ and later ܡܥ̈ܠܠܬܐ) for the postponement of wrath and allow the evil ones the opportunity to repent. For one hundred years God waited patiently, His whetted sword dangling above the heads of the iniquitors so that compassion was poured out while the ark was being constructed.[181] Like Narsai, Jacob argues that the ark was unnecessary, for God was able to save Noah without it. Neither Enoch nor Elijah needed an ark and Lot was saved by an angel who held his hand.[182] Yet instead of recognizing the ark as the wonder which it was, the licentious ones mocked Noah and ignored the warnings issued by its construction. Grace was then bound up by Justice and wrath was withheld only until Noah entered the ark.[183]

The miracle of the gathering of the animals is elaborated upon in the homily under discussion. Firstly, Jacob enters into Noah's thoughts and expresses his concerns, e.g. "how can I gather all of the species, when I don't even know what they are? and how can I accomplish this in seven days?". The Hint came swiftly to his aid so that all converged at the ark.[184] Contrasting pairs of wild and tame animals entered such as eagles and small birds, lions and sheep, bears and lambs, snakes and doves, and all were at peace.[185] These species represent the different groups of people in the world: rich and poor, chaste, savage and greedy. It was the mystery (ܐܪܙܐ) of the Lord which stood at the ark and pacified the species, for upon seeing this image (or type) they were subdued. Their peace was that of the holy church whose symbols were depicted for seven days.[186] Seven days long Mercy pushed Justice aside, but when this too was ignored, wrath finally came upon earth. While the hand of compassion, the Hint of the Commandment, closed the door of the ark, the waters of the firmament were released.[187] It was not simply rain from the clouds which descended but a breaching of the founts of the deep. Waters called to waters (Ps. 42,8)[188] and those from above met those below. The earth, which would otherwise have been irreparably shattered by the repeated poundings, was saved by the cushioning effect of the waters below rising upwards.[189] But as for humanity, none was pitied. For the babes were the product of adultery and the elderly were the most sinful, having filled their many years with iniquity.[190]

Noah and the animals with him were protected from the turmoil outside of the ark by the great mystery (ܐܪܙܐ) which acted as its captain, oars and sailor.[191] In the ark were shown the ensign (ܢܝܫܐ) of the Son and the type of His church as well as many figures (ܦܠܐ̈ܬܐ).[192] The waters discerned His image in the wood and bowed their shoulders to bear it. Inside the ark, Noah himself resembled God in descending from the third and uppermost storey to feed the animals after which he ascended. All looked to Noah as to God for their supplies and obeyed his commands, just as the natures above long for Him who supports them.[193] Symbols continue to abound after the ark, like a bird, landed in its nest upon Qardu.[194] Noah sent forth a raven, a predator whose voraciousness and impurity meant that the mystery (ܐܪܙܐ) would not accompany it.[195] This is why its mission failed and a dove was sent in its stead. The plucking of a branch of an olive tree, but not an olive, makes clear that the dove was not in search of food. The branch was full of symbols (ܐܪ̈ܙܐ) in which many figures (ܦܠܐ̈ܬܐ) were depicted. The olive tree, firstly, is the wood of anointment and as such depicts symbolically (ܐܪܙܢܐܝܬ) both the

---

[179] *Ibid.*, p. 18-19.
[180] *Ibid.*, p. 19-20.
[181] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[182] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[183] *Ibid.*, p. 23-24.
[184] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[185] *Ibid.*, p. 26-28.
[186] *Ibid.*, p. 29-30.

[187] *Ibid.*, p. 30. So too Narsai, Hom. II, st. 342. According to Išo'dad, p. 119,28-120,3, Basil, Ephrem and Narsai believed that the waters above the firmament poured down. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl. p. 75,n.4.

[188] Cf. Narsai, Hom. II, st. 419.

[189] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 32-33.

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 34-35.

[191] Cf. Narsai, Hom. II, 517-524 and Ephrem (Beck, *CNis.* I,3) who compares his tormented situation during the seige of Nisibis to the ark's peace among the waves with Christ as its navigator. For a discussion of this imagery, cf. Murray, *Symbols of Church*, p. 249-253.

[192] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 38.

[193] *Ibid.*, p. 45. Cf. Ephrem (Beck, *Parad.* II,12) where the cattle is on the lowest level, the birds in the middle and Noah on the uppermost storey of the ark, like God. Further comparison is made with Mount Sinai at the time of the giving of the law.

[194] *Ibid.*, p 43. For the ark as a bird, cf. Ephrem (Beck, *Eccl.* XI,21).

[195] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

anointed Christ and the oil. In it the Holy Spirit and baptism are also revealed in types (ܒܛܘܦܣܐ ܓܠܝܐ). As such the peace of the world and good news were being borne by the dove which was the messenger of true things.[196] The dove's arrival in the evening was symbolic as well, for it depicted the type of the world and its salvation at the end of the day when the Son was redeemed.[197]

Changing metaphors, Jacob next describes the news brought by the dove as a letter from mother earth to Noah. She tells of her desolation and barrenness and begs him to descend and rebuild her ruins and cultivate the ground.[198] Noah promises comfort and makes ready to depart, waiting for God's command to tell him to go forth as it had commanded him to take shelter. This it did as at first, but whereas "you and your sons" was said prior to the flood (Gen. 6,18), Noah was commanded to go out, "you and your wife" (Gen. 8,16). Clearly, Jacob says, God meant them to preserve chastity (ܕܢܛܘܪ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܐ) in the ark and repopulate and rebuild the earth after the flood.[199] The first building Noah constructed was an altar to reconcile God, that the iniquity of the earth be removed before Justice. Although God does not eat, Noah sought a means (ܒܥܐ ܥܠܬܐ) to reconcile God and provided Him with a meal, as Jacob was to do for Isaac. The offering was not great, but it is not the offering but the great love, faith and purity of heart of he who offers which is important.[200] Thus God was reconciled, not by the smell of the offering but by the love which rose up. He then wrote a love letter to the earth through Noah and took back the maidservant who had been cast aside.[201] He promised forgiveness and sealed His anger, that it no longer go forth in strife. He vowed that He would no longer scourge the earth with rods of water; nor would seed and harvest, cold and warmth, summer and winter, day and night ever be abolished (Gen. 8,22). Earth, through Noah, demanded a sign that floods would never return and this was given in the form of a bow, slack as proof of silenced battle. Unstrung,

---

[196] *Ibid.*, p. 49-50. According to Ephrem (Beck, *Virg.* VI,3-4) the olive tree, first-born of the trees after the flood, is like Christ, first-born of the dead and the branch is the pledge of resurrection. The dove sought cultivated land/peace (ܫܝܢܐ) and brought good news and greetings of peace from Christ. It informed Noah that mercy (ܚܢܢܐ) had conquered wrath (ܪܘܓܙܐ) and was a mirror of peace in which the peace of the earth was seen.

[197] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[198] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[199] *Ibid.*, p. 53-54.

[200] *Ibid.*, p. 56. These thoughts are similar to those of Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,3-5).

[201] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

the bow indicated that arrows of water would no longer rain down upon the earth for destruction. Mercy hung it in the clouds as a useless instrument which no longer had a task to perform.[202] God wrote out a contract, making himself accountable to the earth, so that upon seeing it humanity demand peace. Truly wondrous was this contract produced by compassion, written by love and sealed by mercy. For unlike other documents, it was not erased by water but radiated its beauty precisely when wet.[203]

4.8 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem

Jacob of Sarug, like Narsai, is clearly dependent upon Ephrem, but the degree of his dependence upon the latter differs noticeably from that of his contemporary. All three authors see a direct tie between the abundance of iniquity on earth in Noah's days (Gen. 6,5) and the taking of the beautiful daughters of men by the sons of Gods (Gen. 6,2). The "sons of God" are identified by Ephrem, Narsai and Jacob as the sons of Seth and the "daughters of men" as the Cainites. The former are called such due to their righteousness and are further designated by Ephrem and Jacob as sons of judges (ܒܢ̈ܝ ܕ̈ܝܢܐ). Having been separated from the Sethites by Abel's murder, the Cainites then descended from the lofty regions surrounding Paradise. The spread of iniquity commenced when the Sethites abandoned their dwelling place, having been seduced by the loveliness of the daughters of Cain. Ephrem and Jacob add here that melodies produced by Jubal's instruments attracted the Sethites. Both authors, in an aside, also engage in polemics against those who think that the sons of God are either angels or Satan. For if these could couple with humans, they argue, the world would be filled by their offspring. Thus the mighty ones (ܓܢܒܪ̈ܐ) produced by the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men (Gen. 6,4) are not supernatural beings but ones great in stature and acclaim like their fathers, the descendants of mighty Seth and Enosh. Narsai, on the other hand, says that the offspring was not great in stature but in iniquity and of ill-repute.[204]

God's declaration of regret and grief (Gen. 6,6) leads our authors to the problem of God's omniscience. All three agree that God's words were meant to lead men to repentance. Ephrem and Jacob specify that the extent of man's wickedness is indicated without a summary of their deeds by the fact that He who doesn't regret, felt regret. It is at this point that the interplay of (personified) justice or wrath and grace or mercy figures in all the works at hand. Whereas mankind was worthy of destruction, mercy intervened several times to stave off justice. Thus the construction of the ark, the gathering of the animals, and the added delay of seven days offered opportunity for repentance. Narsai and Jacob state explicitly what Ephrem implies: God could have saved Noah without an ark and so its construction was meant as a message to the sinners. Narsai adds that the bringing of supplies into the ark also served as instruction, this time for Noah who learned to take care of himself. For it was God who cared for the inhabitants of the ark, as no supplies brought in by Noah and his sons could have sufficed. The gathering of the animals, wild and tame in combinations reminiscent of Is. 11 is common to all three authors who conclude that the iniquitous remained unimpressed by this spectacle and mocked Noah, being simply amused by that which took place before their eyes. This shows how wicked they were, for it was clear that the task of gathering the animalswas beyond human ability and it was none other than the Hint who enabled it. The fact that God saved a remnant from His first creation, proves, according to Ephrem and Narsai, that creation itself was not inherently evil.

---

[202] *Ibid.*, p. 58-59.

[203] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[204] Here he is close to Theodore (Devreesse, *Comm. Psalm.*, p. 154,26-155,7), Diyarb., p. 55,23-26, Išo'dad, p. 111,21-23; 114,21-22 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 120,10-12. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., p. 71,n.45.

After all species entered, Noah and his family were commanded to "Go into the ark". At this point the discrepancies between the authors, especially Narsai versus Ephrem and Jacob, are significant. Ephrem and Jacob stress Noah's chastity, basing their notion on Gen. 6,18 and 7,7 where Noah is said to have entered with his sons, his wife and his sons' wives, i.e. men and women separately. Upon leaving the ark, the men and women are paired once more (Gen. 8,16.18) in order to repopulate the world. This difference in the wording of the biblical text seems unimportant to Narsai as attested by the fact that he substitutes the order found in Gen 7,7 for that of Gen 8,18 in his account of the departure from the ark. The description of the flood, the waters of the abyss welling up and destroying all ages is equally dramatic in Narsai's and Jacob's homilies but while Jacob and Ephrem wonder about the destruction of the innocent animals, Narsai remains silent on the matter. While havoc is wreaked outside the ark, all is quiet within. This is because the ark was being navigated by a special sailor, winds and stars. For Narsai it is the Hint, for Ephrem and Jacob the Son. According to the latter two authors, the ark is full of the symbols of Christ: its wood and its course recall the cross; its peace is the peace of the church where all types of people live harmoniously like the animals in the ark; Noah's ministrations are like God's to those below. The types, symbols and figures continue to abound in the dove's mission. Together with the olive branch the dove represents Christ and chrism, baptism and the Holy Spirit.

The reader may have noted in the presentation of Ephrem's work thus far, that typology occurs rarely in the *Commentary on Genesis* while it is quite common in his hymns. Similar motifs in the homilies of Jacob and Narsai are derived from both Ephrem's commentary and hymns. All three authors, for example, explain that it was Noah's faith and purity of will which reconciled God and not his sacrifices. They also attribute the guiding of the ship to an outside force. The force is the Hint, says Narsai; but according to Jacob it is the Son. In the second example, Jacob clearly choses a christological interpretation while Narsai does not. One may say in general that Jacob's use of typology is extensive while Narsai is restrained in its application. Interesting is Narsai's digression on the departure from the ark in springtime. He links the creation of the world in Nisan with the exodus from Egypt and Christ's resurrection in this same month. Although several of these events are similarly related in Ephrem's hymns,[205] the disembarkment from the ark in Iyar is not explicitly connected to the other springtime events.[206] Aside from Noah's opening the window of the ark in Nisan, the element uniting the flood story to the (earlier) Nisan motif is surely the recreation of the world through Noah.

Lastly, two additional themes found in Narsai's homilies will be considered. The first is a variant of that found in the writings of Ephrem while the second is absent from the latter's works. The eating of the meat of animals granted by the covenant made between God and Noah after the flood (Gen. 9,3–6) is new, says Narsai. Men must therefore learn to treat each other with care. For inasmuch as man is created in God's image, his murder is a great crime. One may recall that Ephrem sees here yet another aspect of man's having been created in God's image, i.e. the sovereignty to let live or die. The second is the burying of Noah's ark in order to prevent idolatry. Narsai includes this act among the devices employed by God to instruct man and prevent him from sinning. Jacob's views remain unknown to the reader as his homily deals neither with the covenant of Gen. 9 nor with the fate of the ark nor with Noah's drunkeness and the blessings of his sons. It is quite possible that the latter two were dealt with in moralistic homilies or in yet another homily on the flood lost to posterity.

---

[205] Ephrem (Beck, *Eccl.* LI,4–5.8 and *idem.*, *Resurr.* IV). See p. 76,n.32 above.

[206] Elements from the flood story are included in *Eccl.* LI,3, where the peace of the ark is said to symbolize the church and in *Resurr.* IV,5, where Noah's sons cover his nakedness as Nisan covers the earth with flowers. Perhaps Noah's offering (of which God smelled the ܪܝܚܐ ܕܒܣܡܘܬܐ ܪܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ in Pesh. Gen. 9,21) is being hinted at in *Resurr.* IV,12 when God is said to have walked on earth (Gen. 3,8) in Nisan, the month which offered spices and sweet smelling sacrifices (ܒܣܡܘܬܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ), prophesying Christ's descent and offering.

4.9 Jacob of Sarug's Homily on the Tower of Babel

In view of the close relationship established between Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem with regard to both the flood story and Enoch and Elijah, one may rightly expect the ideas expressed in Jacob's homily "On the Tower of Babel" to approximate those of Ephrem as found in both the *Commentary on Genesis* and the hymns. Yet the opening stichs of this homily lead the reader to other thoughts. God, says Jacob, is a schoolmaster who, moved by love, lashes his pupils that they benefit. The race of man is in need of instruction, as indicated by the history of the abuse of its freedom up to the time of the construction of the tower of Babel. Adam was the first to go astray and after he ate of the fruit of the tree, the earth was struck. The race of the just (the Sethites) defiled themselves with the daughters of Cain and destruction followed. Next the Chaldeans rebelled in Babel and were constrained. Yet the punishments in all three cases were not just deserts but chastisement full of compassion. Adam's transgression warranted death; the generation of the flood didn't deserve to have a remnant saved in order to inhabit the earth; the citizens of Babel should have been burned by the fire of wrath.[207] We recognize here yet again the theme of justice withheld by compassion, although now presented as a form of instruction. But before we can learn more about Divine pedagogics, Jacob turns to the events leading to chastisement in Gen. 11.

After the flood, God displayed compassion through Noah, the second Adam, so that the world be repopulated. According to God's blessings, men multiplied on earth and went forth to inhabit the devastated earth.[208] It was then that rebellion raised its head full of misconceived proposals formulated by Jacob in a series of stichs commencing with "Come, let us". United and of one mind, the people were resolved to join together in a great mass so as not to be dispersed. By remaining one people, they would be assured that no peoples would arise to usurp their name. Against God and His flood other measures were required – the building of a city and a tower which would not fall if inundated. Although Jacob does not say that their fears were unfounded, he makes clear that the builders' true motivation was other than fear.[209] For they had hired themselves out to error, wishing to ascend to God on high, trample upon the place of the angels, storm heaven and make a name for themselves more illustrious than the stars in the sky. A reputation is indeed what they gained, for they would serve as a byword (ܡܬܠܐ) for future generations.[210]

The biblical account proceeds in Gen. 11,5 with God descending to see the city and the tower which men were building. Once more, one is led to question God's omniscience, for if He is all-knowing, why does He need to descend and then decide what to do? Jacob does not voice this question but states that God mocked the laborers saying, "nothing which they planned to do will not be carried out" (Gen. 11,6). Precisely because God knew their intentions was He able to devise a two-phased plan to deal with them. First He allowed them to commence their work so that they torture and weary themselves, providing their own punishment. The rebellion was conceived by their own free will and when being destroyed, they could hardly claim that they'd had no choice. Yet despite the weariness produced by their own madness, they persisted in rebellion.[211] God's compassion was stirred upon seeing them thus tormented and construed a cause or means (ܪܟܒ ܥܠܬܐ) of correction[212] in order to change the situation. Wishing to put an end to their lashings, God showed His zeal as if furious (ܐܝܟ ܠܡ), and while His compassion was truly aroused, He rebuked the iniquitous in the guise of wrath (ܒܦܪܨܘܦ ܚܡܬܐ). Thus He said, "Let us descend and divide them into tongues and disperse them from the unity of their rebellion". They will dwell in many places and not in one place, and be called "peoples" and not "people".[213]

How are these words to be understood as compassion in the form of anger? Jacob lets the reader await an answer while he first considers the great mystery hidden in the words recorded by Moses. It is written that God said, "Come, let us descend and divide the tongues" (Gen. 11,7). Whom did God address if not His Son, Jacob asks. This a point of contention with the Jews, for they deny God has a Son. But how could God speak in this fashion to angels, who are but servants who cover their faces before Him? Only one equal to Him in Godhead

---

[207] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, p. 3.
[208] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

---

[209] *Ibid.*, p. 6–7.
[210] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[211] *Ibid.*, p. 9–10.
[212] ܡܪܕܘܬܐ (correction, from the root ܪܕܝ), calls to mind ܡܪܕܐ (from the root ܡܪܕ), meaning both rebellion and tower.
[213] *Ibid.*, p. 12–13.

is being disclosed, the hypostases (ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ) of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Otherwise one introduces gods alongside of God and is engaged in blasphemy! Why, then, does God need to speak in words to His Son and the Holy Spirit, for surely God doesn't need to converse?[214] In this way He disclosed a hidden mystery by means of figures (ܦܠܐ̈ܬܐ) in the text.[215] Yet the Jew fails to recognize these and denies Christ although His story was revealed in truth, place by place. In combatting the Jews, Jacob explains further why God revealed His offspring at the tower of Babel. It was precisely at this time that the peoples came into existence and went to many places. God was determined to populate the devastated world and called upon an intermediary to cultivate/pacify (ܕܫܝܢ) the places. Just as He had established the worlds from the beginning through His Son (Jo. 1,3; Heb. 1,2) and called to Him at Adam's creation (Gen. 1,26), so He was present when the peoples were established. In will and not words, God spoke to Him in whom the forces of angels were commanded, and all creatures came into being. He is the image and glory of God (Heb. 1,3), His Only-begotten, Son and Lord, Fashioner of the worlds.

In this long section on the activity of the Son – Jacob's discussion of the Holy Spirit being negligible – a clue has been given about the working of God's compassion. At the same time Jacob says "God was determined (to populate the world)". These words are often used by Narsai when explaining the working of the Divine economy and one will recall that it was precisely against this notion that Jacob protested with regard to Adam's mortality[216] Yet the confusion ushered in by God at Babel was precisely the cause of the fashioning of the world.[217] Those who made peace with each other were united to destroy peace on earth and God raised His sword to pacify/cultivate the earth. Tongues were confused and work was abandoned because of the hatred which germinated. Each individual learned a new language from God while not sensing the master or His wise designs.[218] But one who is perceptive knows that evil and hateful things are good, for chastisement was a means (ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܥܠܬܐ) for God to fashion the world. Had He not dispersed them, the multitudes would have

---

[214] Cf. Jacob's discussion of Gen. 1,26 in Jansma, "L'Hexaméron", p. 34. God the Father did not say, "Let us make man" in an audible voice, for Father and Son are one in spirit and one in thought. So too Ephrem, who says that the silence which arises when creatures are confronted with God's hiddenness resembles the silence which exists between Father and Son (Beck, *HdF.* XLIV,8).

[215] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, p. 13-15.

[216] See above, ch. 3.8.

[217] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, p. 20.

[218] *Ibid.*, p. 21-23.

suffocated in Babel.[219] Thus it is in correction that God showed mercy, prolonging peace, settling the earth and putting an end to evil counsel.[220] The blessing given to Abraham as a gift, that he become the father of peoples instead of one people, was given in a sentence to those who rebelled. In this way even God's blows are healing.[221]

4.10 Narsai, Jacob of Sarug and Ephrem

According to Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis*, the true motivation for the building of the tower of Babel was vainglory (ܫܒܗܪܘܬܗܘܢ), i.e. the desire to establish a name, for there was none to disperse those united as they claimed. Nowhere is it stated in the bible that the builders feared another flood, yet Ephrem assumes that one builds a city for protection against enemies and a tower to escape that which rises up, e.g. flood waters. Having presented their alleged fears, Ephrem then proves that these were ungrounded and proceeds to unveil their true intentions. Both Jacob and Narsai place these arguments in the mouths of the builders in series of stichs commencing with "Come, let us". Aside from the desire to escape a flood and usurp God's throne, revenge is added by Narsai to the list of motives for the construction.

Descending to see the tower and the city, God said, "Nothing which they planned will not be carried out" (Gen. 11,6). For Ephrem this means that "they will not escape punishment; for the opposite of that which they said ("That we not be dispersed") will happen".[222] In other words, in voicing their unfounded fears, they predicted that which would happen in punishment. Jacob of Sarug interprets the verse to mean that Justice allowed the Chaldeans to commence the labor to which their hard hearts had directed them. They would thus be brought low by their own labor and of their own free will. Had God not delivered them to correction, He wouldn't have allowed them to go ahead with their plans. Thus the realization of their goals was punishment in itself. That which outwardly appeared to be punishment, i.e. the dispersion and division of tongues, was in fact an act of mercy. For humanity was granted peace in division and space to expand according to God's plans. Jacob's ideas are similar to Narsai's but not identical. For Narsai, God's words in Gen. 11,6 constitute an observation: the people are so obsessed with their plans that they will not cease until all is accomplished. Although admittedly not explicitly stated, Narsai's description of the tireless labor suggests this interpretation.[223] In order to save the builders from self-destruction, God, in compassion, mixed love in a sentence which would put an end to their pain and cut off the spread of iniquity. The sentence entails the very dispersion which they feared and the disruption of their unity by the divison of tongues. The form of wrath of which God made use, was meant to frighten men. This is a method utilized by God in Paradise and at the flood, in order to reestablish peace. Both Jacob and Narsai emphasize God's guidance and instruction of the peoples in their new tongues and locations.

---

[219] *Ibid.*, p. 23-24.

[220] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[221] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[222] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 66,10-12).

The next issue raised by the three writers is to whom did God address the words "Come, let us descend"? All agree that the angels are not worthy of being addressed in such fashion. It was to the Son and the Holy Spirit that God spoke. Although Ephrem notes that ܬܘ must be directed to at least two, he nowhere explains the role of the Holy Spirit. He notes simply that the early and later tongues (Gen. 11 and Acts 2) were given through the mediation of the Son and the Spirit. Jacob too devotes a limited number of words to the Trinity but is expansive on the subject of the Son. He attacks the Jews who ignore the biblical revelation of the Son, including Gen. 1,26. The Son is primarily presented as He through whom all was created. Jacob's source is undoubtedly Ephrem who, it should be noted, sees in Gen. 1,26 a reference only to the Son through whom all was created.[224] Narsai too refers both to Acts 2 and Gen. 1,26. The division at Babel is said to be a symbol of the gift to the apostles, provided so that that which would be would not be experienced as strange when it took place. This is the reason often given by Narsai for the disclosure of symbolic events[225] and it applies to Gen. 1,26 as well. Citing the words "Let us make man" preceded by the cohortative "Come" (which is found neither in the biblical quotations of Ephrem or Jacob), Narsai notes a parallel to Gen. 11,7 and sees the revelation of the mystery of the hypostases of the Son and the Holy Spirit in both.

The questions next posed by Jacob and Narsai differ. The former inquires why God needs to speak to His Son in words and the latter asks how God descended. The Father and Son are of one will, Jacob explains, and no words are necessary between them. It was in order to reveal that the Father has a Son

---

[223] Hom. IV, st. 180-193, esp. 191, "they were waiting for the time when they would see the completion of the labor". So too Diyarb., p. 68,14-18 and Išo'dad, p. 137,10-14.

[224] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 23,18-23) refers to both Jo. 1 and Heb. 1. Cf. Ephrem (Beck, *HdF*. VI,6-16).

[225] See below, ch. 5.

that these words were made audible. Narsai's question arises from his christology, i.e. how the Word descended to dwell in man. Thus the problems broached by Jacob with regard to the Trinity approximate those raised by Ephrem and the fourth century, while the theological discussions of the fifth century are fleetingly reflected in Narsai's excursus.[226] Nevertheless, the most prominent features of Jacob's and Narsai's homilies on the tower correspond: God's use of the form (ܐܣܟܡܐ) or guise(ܦܪܨܘܦܐ)[227] of wrath mixed with compassion and love, not to punish but to instruct the people, protecting them from further iniquity while accomplishing predetermined plans.

4.11 Narsai and B.M. Add. 17,189 fol. 17-21

If folia 17-21 of B.M. Add. 17,189 form part of the Syriac version of Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on Genesis, as has been suggested by Jansma,[228] then these would be the only extant fragments on Gen. 4, 6 and 8 with which Narsai's homilies may be compared. In the first instance, Jansma concludes on the basis of the biblical quotations found in these folia that the unidentified commentary is of Greek origin.[229] Further study has pointed out exegetical parallels between the fragments and the works of representatives of the school of Antioch and those of the later commentators Išo'dad of Merv and Theodore bar Koni.[230] These parallels not only convey the same ideas but make use of the same wording. Lastly, the same key terms and preference for certain words found in the Syriac fragments of Theodore's Genesis commentary published by Sachau[231] and Tonneau[232] are found in B.M. Add. 17,189 as well.[233]

---

[226] Jansma, in "The Credo of Jacob", notes on the basis of Jacob's hexameron, that "This man who ... did his upmost to keep away from the conflict which had arisen between Alexandrian and western christology, is full of nostalgia for the unity of the preceding century" (p. 32). Cf. p. 35.

[227] The term ܦܪܨܘܦܐ has christological implications for Narsai (McLeod, p. 26 and I, 442; IV, 297-298), hence the use of ܐܣܟܡܐ. According to Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 35, the former term is used in a christological sense by Jacob "only with reference to the views of Nestorius and of the Council of Chalcedon".

[228] Jansma, "Théodore" p. 63-92.

[229] *Art. cit.*, p. 82-83. According to Jansma, Syriac translations of Greek bible citations are provided when the latter disagree with the Pesh. Should the harmonization of the two prove to be impossible (e.g. LXX ᾽Αραράτ and Pesh. ܩܪܕܘ), the Syriac version is given first, followed by the Greek which is introduced by ܝܘܢܝܐ. However, this procedure, which occurs only once in the fragments (Gen. 8,4), is not limited to the earliest Syriac translations of Theodore but also occurs in later works of the East-Syrian tradition. Cf. Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., intro. p. XXXVII-XXXVIII.

[230] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 84-87.

[231] Theodore (Sachau).

The evidence is weighty and Jansma considers his case proven. Although the combination of all these arguments allows a link between the fragments and the Theodore–tradition, the question arises as to whether the fragments belong to the first phase of the translation of Theodore's works. For all of the above may be equally said of Diyarbakır 22 on Gen.–Ex. 9,32.[234] Van Rompay, the editor of this anonymous commentary, in fact notes similarities between the "formal aspects and stylistic characteristics" of the work and the fragments published by Staab, Sachau, Tonneau and Jansma.[235] One may thus ask whether the fragments published by Jansma are indeed the work of Theodore or a later commentator who had access to the same source(s) as the anonymous commentary (and Theodore bar Koni),[236] which would account for the similarities.

That the situation is more complicated than Jansma's presentation may be shown by means of a text used by him to demonstrate Išo'dad's aquaintance with, or even dependence upon, the author of the folia. Jansma notes that both fragment I and Išo'dad explain God's giving a sign to Cain (Gen. 4,15) with the same words: ܥܒܕܗ ܕܠܐ ܢܬܩܛܠ (He made him such that he not be killed). He also rightly observes that the reason given for why Cain did not die is couched in different terms in the two texts.[237] The text of fragment I is as follows: ܐܠܐ ܦܐܫ ܐܢܬ ܒܚܝ̈ܐ ܠܗ ܠܙܒܢܐ ܢܓܝܪܐ. ܟܕ ܐܬܪܕܝܬ ܒܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܠܡܘܟܣܐ ܕܚܙ̈ܝܢܟ. (But you will remain alive a long time while being chastised, as an admonition to those who see you).[238] Išo'dad's variant is: ܐܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܡܘܪܕܐ ܠܕܪ̈ܐ ܕܐܬܝܢ (rather that he be a(n object of) fright for the coming generations).[239] Diyarbakır (not cited by Jansma) seems to be a combination of the two: ܐܠܐ ܢܬܛܪ ܠܗ ܠܙܒܢܐ ܢܓܝܪܐ ܠܡܘܪܕܐ ܕܚܙ̈ܝܢܘܗܝ (rather that he continue (to live) for a long time as a(n object of) fright to those who see him.[240] It is interesting to note that Narsai is an earlier witness to the same tradition: ܒܗ: ܥܒܕܗ ܐܬܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܪܡܙܐ ܕܡܠܗ ܢܛܪ ܠܗ. ܒܚܝ̈ܐ ܢܛܪܗ ܠܩܛܘܠܐ ܠܡܘܪܕܐ ܠܕܪ̈ܐ ܕܐܬܝܢ. (...making this the sign: that His Hint would protect him. He preserved the murderer alive, for a fright for the coming generations).[241] The use of ܡܘܪܕܐ is common to Diyarbakır, Išo'dad and Narsai and one may conjecture that Išo'dad is dependent upon Narsai,[242] seeing the exact parallel of the final three words in both texts. In any case, the ideas expressed by all the authors is the same and one is at a loss to know which of the terms (ܡܘܟܣܐ or ܡܘܪܕܐ) represents the earliest Syriac translations of Theodore's works and which the reworking of his ideas in the school.

A brief look at the other fragments will serve to complicate matters even further. Išo'dad, although dependent upon Diyarbakır, follows fragments II and IV more closely than he does Diyarbakır in his remarks on Gen. 4,17 and 8,1.[243] This may mean that Išo'dad, while drawing on Diyarbakır (who in turn drew on the unknown author of the fragments?) also consulted directly the source of Diyarbakır from time to time. Yet we have seen that for Gen. 4,15, he follows Narsai and not the text of the fragment. As far as fragments III and V are concerned, the identification of the "sons of God" with the descendants of Seth[244] and the dating of the beginning of the flood to the summer[245] are so common[246] that they cannot suffice to prove Theodore's authorship of the fragments.

Returning to the study of the relationship between Narsai's homilies on Gen. 6–11 and the relevant fragments, irrespective of the authorship of the latter, certain correspondences may be noted. Both authors speak of the sons of Seth having succumbed to desires so that they mixed (frag. III ܡܬܚܠܛܘ; Narsai ܐܬܚܠܛܘ/ܚܠܛ) with the daughters of Cain (Gen. 6,2). Unlike fragment III, however, Narsai explains neither the withdrawal of God's "spirit" on account of man's being "flesh", nor the seeming reduction of the one hundred and twenty years to one hundred, but merely quotes the first part of Gen. 6,3

---

[232] Theodore (Tonneau).

[233] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 89–91.

[234] Van Rompay, Diyarb. The editor dates the commentary to the 7-8th c. (Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., intro. p. LII–LIII).

[235] Van Rompay, "Nestorian Commentary" p. 70–73 and Diyarb., transl., intro. p. XIX–XXII.

[236] It has already been convincingly argued by Van Rompay, "Išo' bar Nun and Išo'dad of Merv", p. 229–249, that Išo'dad is dependent upon both the anonymous commentary and Išo' b. Nun. Theod. b. Koni seems to have drawn upon the same source as the anonymous commentary although no interdependence between him and Diyarb. has been established. It has most recently been argued by Molenberg, *Interpreter*, p. 330–340, that Išo' b. Nun was also not dependent on Diyarb.

[237] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 84–5.

[238] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 67, fol. 18r,14–15. Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 18r,2–5.

[239] Išo'dad, p. 101,2–3.

[240] Diyarb., p. 49,28–29.

[241] Gignoux, IV, 409–410.

[242] Narsai is quoted several times by name in Išo'dad's commentary (see above, ch. 1 and Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, transl., intro. p. XV) and some anonymous quotes have in all likelihood been derived from Narsai as well.

[243] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 85–6 and Diyarb., p. 50,8–9 and p. 59,26–28.

[244] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 69–70, fol. 19r,11–13.

[245] *Ibid.*, p. 74, fol. 21r,8–9.

[246] For the "sons of God" see Narsai, Hom. II, st. 145–160 and n.22–23. For rain in the summer, see Narsai, Hom. II, st. 709–712, Diyarb., p. 59,22–23 and Išo'dad, p. 117,20–23 and 121,2–4.

("Henceforth my spirit will not dwell among man forever"). There are no true parallels between fragment IV and Narsai, whereas Jacob of Sarug, like the author of the fragments, indicates that it was God who told Noah to open the window of the ark at the proper moment.[247]

The most interesting fragment with regard to Narsai is fragment V. Here the unknown author identifies the day upon which Noah opened the window of the ark with the beginning of creation, i.e. the first of Nisan (Gen. 18,3),[248] and this was rightly so because a second fashioning commenced with Noah. As we have seen above, Narsai too links the first of Nisan at the end of the flood with the Nisan of creation. But unlike fragment V, it is not the collecting of the waters which Narsai sees as common to the two Nisans, but the adornment of the earth with trees and flowers. Narsai's vernal descriptions lead him to other associations with spring familiar to Ephrem's readers:[249] the exodus from Egypt and the renewal of creation through Christ, the firstfruits. These events are the parallels of the exodus of those resurrected after having been buried in the ark[250] and the renewal of creation through Noah. Thus the connections vaguely made between Noah, Nisan and creation by Ephrem[251] are made explicit in the fragments and Narsai's homily. In fragment V, the list of correspondences between Noah and the first creation grows longer. Just as the animals were created in pairs in the beginning, so those saved from the flood were paired except the clean animals who survived seven by seven. The latter was "in view of man's needs (ܣܘܢܩܢܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ) for the convenience of the later fashioning, because a more abundant usage was appropriate, on account of man's honor (ܐܝܩܪܐ ܕܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ)".[252] Narsai offers a related but more specific explanation, not when comparing the two fashionings but when commenting on Gen. 7,2–3. God multiplied and brought in the clean ones (ܐܣܓܝ ܘܐܥܠ ܠܕܟܝ̈ܐ) which would be needed by him (ܕܣܢܝܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ) once he went forth; for He would permit him to eat meat and raise up sacrifices from them (ܘܢܣܩ ܒܗܘܢ ܠܥܠܬܐ).[253] Once more Išo'dad combines the two commentaries: "When He commanded him to make an ark, He commanded him to bring in male and female, two by two. Yet upon entering the ark, the prophet writes that he (Noah) brought in clean ones seven by seven and unclean ones paired, in order to show that for the preservation of their species two by two sufficed; but on account of man's needs, who is more honored than all (ܣܘܢܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܡܝܩܪ ܡܢ ܟܠ) and because of the offering of sacrifices before God (ܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܕܒܚ̈ܐ) he multiplied the clean ones (ܐܣܓܝ ܕܕܟܝ̈ܬܐ)".[254] Again, it is unclear whether fragment V represents a translation of Theodore's commentary or a reworking of it (including school traditions) while Narsai's homilies incorporate the traditions of the school. Thus a comparison of Narsai with the unknown author necessarily leads to a discussion of the process of the transmission of Theodore's works and the traditions of the school and the degree of importance attached to both. This question wil be treated more fully in the final chapter of this study.

---

[247] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, IV, p. 53. Cf. Išo'dad, p. 121,6–7.

[248] The author explains (Jansma, *art. cit.*, 74, fol. 21r,23–28) that the first month is that in which day and night are equal. Cf. Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 12,12–13).

[249] Ephrem (Beck, *Resurr.* IV). See p. 76,n.32 above.

[250] Noah entered the ark on the seventeenth of Iyar and went out on the twenty seventh of Iyar according to Narsai, who makes no further comment on the chronology of the flood.

[251] Ephrem (Beck, *Resurr.* IV,5) writes that Nisan covers the earth with flowers like Noah's sons cover his nakedness. In *Resurr.* IV,10 the Lord of thunder softens His might with mercy in Nisan.

[252] Jansma, *art. cit.*, p. 75, fol. 21v,13–17.

4.12 The East-Syrian Exegetes on Gen. 6–11

4.12.a Cosmas Indicopleustes and Cyrus of Edessa

Cosmas offers three reasons for God's bringing on the flood.[255] Firstly, God wanted to wipe out the sinners and save the just for the instruction of future generations. Secondly, the flood would prevent those who would die anyway from adding to their sins. Third, God wanted to transfer men to a better place nearly equal to Paradise. All three reasons form part of Cosmas's notion of the Divine Economy upon which he elaborates in the sections which follow those on the reasons for the flood, but also elsewhere. This includes God's wish to lead men to a better situation whereby He makes use of causes or pretexts. In the flood story the sins of the wicked are the cause by which God puts an end to the penurious situation of man since Adams' fall.[256] The sin committed is the mingling of the sons of Seth, who are called sons of God, with the daughters of Cain. [257] Clearly, the situation improves enormously after the flood, for men, who are "God's image" (Gen. 9,6), are allowed to eat meat and fruits and drink wine.[258] In this connection Cosmas argues against those who think that Abel ate meat[259] and says that Noah's drunkenness proves that he had no experience in drinking wine. Men were both instructed by God and given hope. Death entered after Adam's transgression in order to make him hate sin and desire immortality.[260] So too death brought about by the flood was not in wrath but to prevent further sinning[261] and put an end to painful life one earth. Hope was provided from the avenging of Abel's blood, the translation of Enoch, the saving of Noah from the flood and the election of Abraham.[262] All these ideas find their parallels in Narsai's Hom. II. Additionally, the restoring of Adam's honor to Noah in greater measure which includes the permission to eat meat, according to Cosmas, is similarly expressed in the fragments published by Jansma.

---

[253] Narsai, Hom. II, st. 283–286.

[254] Išo'dad, p. 118,12–18.

[255] Cosmas, V, 111–112 (Wolska, II, p. 167–171).

[256] Cosmas, II, 41 (Wolska, I, p. 347–349).

[257] Cosmas, III, 79 (Wolska, I, p. 519).

[258] Cosmas, II, 41 and V, 91 (Wolska, I, p. 347–349; II, p. 137–139).

Noah, involuntarily drunk, saw secret things and predicted the future in the form of a blessing and curse.[263] But Noah neither really blessed nor cursed his sons but foretold the mysteries to be accomplished in Christ. For the sons of Ham were never slaves. To the contrary: Israel served in Egypt. Even the Gibeonites did not serve the sons of Shem, for it was God they served. The blessing means that God would dwell in Shem's tents and the other two brothers would serve Christ in Shem. Here too the similarites to Narsai are evident. Cosmas, however, adds the Gibeonites to those who some might wrongly consider to have served Israel. He also considers God and not Japhet to be the subject of "May he dwell in the tents of Shem" (Gen. 9,26).

The building of the tower, says Cosmas, commenced after men moved outward from the east where the ark had landed to the plain of Shinar. The reasons construed by the generation of the division for the construction are twofold: 1) God destroyed men and could do it again if He so desires. A tower would thus serve as protection against the flood when built with water-resistant bricks. 2) United, they could fight against God, being near to Him prior to dispersal. This is the meaning of "make a name prior to dispersal" (LXX Gen. 11,4). Their plans, however, are foiled by God who pitied man more than being angry, knowing the weakness of his flesh which He had endowed with freedom of choice. God saved men from suffering, because they would otherwise perish

---

[259] This seems to be directed against the arguments of Eusebius of Emesa (Hovhannessian, p. 40) that Abel offered animal sacrifices, ate meat and was considered just. Cosmas may perhaps be reiterating Theodore's no longer extant discussion of the matter.
[260] Cosmas, V, 92 (Wolska, II, p. 139).
[261] Cosmas, V, 89 (Wolska, II, p. 135-137).
[262] Cosmas, V, 61 (Wolska, II, p. 95-97).
[263] Cosmas, V, 86 (Wolska, II, p. 131-133).

in the wind and heat atop of the tower or suffer from vertigo and fall. Thus God divided their tongues, putting an end to their folly while establishing them on earth.[264] At Pentecost the tongues were reunited as a gift to the apostles and all proclaimed the marvels of God, for the faithful enter heaven by God's grace.[265] Once more several correspondences may be noticed between Narsai and Cosmas. Both consider east (Gen. 11,2) to be the area near Qardu where Noah and his family disembarked and multiplied. The reasons for the flood are similar although Narsai adds revenge as an additional motive. According to the two the dispersal was an act of mercy and led to the spreading of man throughout the earth. Cosmas's explanation that man's flesh is weak would seem to be based upon Gen. 6,3.5 and 8,21 rather than upon Gen. 11[266] and is unparalleled in Narsai's Hom. IV. The connection between the division of tongues at Babel and the gift of tongues to the apostles is made by both.

Cyrus's remarks on Noah are limited. He calls him the second father who by means of (an ark of) wood was saved, just as the cross redeems.[267] The "Explanation of Pentecost Sunday" naturally leads to the division of tongues. Cyrus too explains the words "man's inclination is evil" in his discussion of Gen. 11. They mean that his inclination is such that not even punishment constrains him. The reasons for the building of the tower are similar to although less expansive than those provided by Cosmas and Narsai. The builders were vainglorious (ܬܪܒܝܬܐ ܡܪܝܘܬ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܘܪܡܫܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ), full of pride and took great pains (ܡܝ ܗܘܘ ܒܥܡܠܬܗܘܢ) to construct the tower. They wanted to combat God who was stronger, being higher up, and punishes men by a flood or other means when He wishes. Constrained neither by fear nor by the transformation to a more excellent situation on account of Noah,[268] they persisted in their labor. God therefore confounded their tongues and divided their unity to prevent them from causing greater harm. Pentecost is a rectification of the situation.[269] Finally, the words "Let us descend" (Gen. 11,7) are said by Cyrus to reveal the Trinity in advance. This is not explained along with the other remarks on Gen. 11 but is included in a list of biblical passages alluding to the Trinity.[270] The similarities between Cyrus and Cosmas are obvious and so too those between Narsai and Cyrus. Some of the same words are used by the latter two in describing the mentality and activity of the builders.

---

[264] Cosmas, III, 2-3 (Wolska, I, p. 439-441).
[265] Cosmas, III, 4 and V, 211 (Wolska, I, p. 441; II, p. 313).
[266] See Diyarb., p. 54,30-55,3, Išo'dad, p. 113,8-26 and Theod. b. Koni, p. 103,2-10.
[267] Cyrus, p. 80,23-81,4.
[268] Macomber, Cyrus, transl., p. 160,n.3, suggests that the "transformation towards excellence" refers to the covenant in which God promised never to wipe out mankind. It is more likely, however, that the transformation meant by Cyrus is the improved situation after the flood. Cf. the preceding paragraphs on Cosmas.
[269] Cyrus, p. 181,14-182,22.

4.12.b Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni, Išo‘ bar Nun and Išo‘dad of Merv

In view of the extensive number of verses covered by Narsai in Hom. II, III and IV, a verse by verse comparison between Narsai and the later East-Syrian exegetes would seem to be beyond the scope of this study. Only the most salient features of the commentaries, especially the points of agreement and disagreement with Narsai, will therefore be presented. Commencing with Lamech's prediction in Gen. 6, an explanation for the name Noah is offered by most commentators. It is said to mean both "rest" (or "serene") and "he who brings relief". While Theodore bar Koni presents the first explanation only,[271] Narsai, Diyarbakır and Išo‘dad present both.[272] The "consolation" Noah was going to offer (Gen. 5,29) was that God would no longer curse the earth on account of man's sins. The curse meant that men had not eaten fruits since Adam's transgression. This idea was already expressed by Cosmas and is repeated by Išo‘dad.[273] So too Diyarbakır, which adds that the consolation hints at Christ from Noah's offspring who would come and renew the world.[274] It will be recalled that according to Ephrem[275] it was only in the year of the flood that seasons and harvests were disturbed.

The reasons for the flood are similar in Narsai, Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išo‘dad.[276] In the first place it was man's wickedness which caused the flood. The second reason was God's wish to transfer men to wide open spaces. The reason why He didn't do this immediately, although He could have, is because men first needed instruction. Theodore bar Koni adds a comparison to the servitude of the Israelites in Egypt prior to their entrance into the Promised Land. He also points to the corrective force embodied in the record of the

---

[270] Cyrus, p. 147,16–148,9.

[271] Theod. b. Koni, p. 184,18.

[272] Narsai, Hom. II, st. 200 and III, st. 19 and 22; Diyarb., p. 53,4–6; Išo‘dad, p. 110,2. The text of the latter is corrupt.

[273] Išo‘dad, p. 110,5–8.

[274] Diyarb., p. 53,8–13.

[275] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 62,11–12).

[276] Narsai, Hom. II, st. 76–104.569–572; Diyarb., p. 53,16–21; Theod. b. Koni, p. 98,19–99,8; Išo‘dad, p. 110,16–26.

events of the flood which parallels the warning provided by the Israelites evil behavior in the desert (1 Cor. 10,11).

What did the wickedness of the generation of the flood entail? All agree that it was the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men (Gen. 6,2), the Sethites and Cainites respectively, which was evil.[277] The commentators are not unanimous about the derivation of the epithet "sons of God". According to Diyarbakır (who is followed by Išo‘dad),[278] the name came from the place where God revealed Himself to men. Išo‘dad later combines two explanations when stating that the Sethites were sons of God because they belonged to His household in abstaining from the Cainites.[279] The product of the union of the two groups were the giants of Gen. 6,4. While for Ephrem these were men great in size,[280] Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išo‘dad, like Narsai, consider them to be great in iniquity.[281] Man's wickedness led God to decree a reduction of man's years to one hundred and twenty (Gen. 6,5). The question arises as to whether or not this number was reached. The biblical text implies that one hundred years passed from the time God addressed Noah at the age of five hundred (Gen. 5,32) until the ark was completed in Noah's six hundredth year (Gen. 7,6.11). Either God had reduced the number of years or He addressed Noah twenty years earlier. Ephrem, Cosmas, and Išo‘dad favor the first option, claiming that God thus prevents the wicked from further sin.[282] Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and once more Išo‘dad, protest that God never reduces the chance He offers to sinners but if anything, mitigates punishment.[283] Narsai abstains from any explanation. The "regret" which God is said to feel (Gen. 6,6) is also interpreted differently by the two groups. Narsai, like Ephrem, claims that God used anthropomorphic terms to encourage men to repent.[284] For

---

[277] Narsai, Hom. II, st. 145–152; Diyarb., p. 54,4–7.11–13; Theod. b. Koni, p. 184,19; Išo‘dad, p. 111,2–3.

[278] Diyarb., p. 54,8–11; Išo‘dad, p. 111,18–20.

[279] Išo‘dad, p. 111,28–29. The commentators agree that the Sethites were separated from the Cainites. However, this is considered a result of Cain's sin and not the cause of Seth's righteouness. Both Išo‘dad and Theod. b. Koni, the latter in the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia, explain at length that men were called God or God's sons which is never the case for angels. Angels are also never called men although the term ܓܒܪ̈ܐ is sometimes used as in Gen. 18 and the name Gabriel. For the name Gabriel, cf. Narsai, Hom. 2, Mingana, I, p. 50–51.

[280] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 57,2–20).

[281] Diyarb., p. 55,24–26; Theod. b. Koni, p. 102,10–13; Išo‘dad, p. 11,21–24 and 114,21–22; Narsai, Hom. II, st. 161–164.

[282] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 60,19–30); Cosmas, II, 41 and V, 84 (Wolska, I, p. 347–349; II, p. 135–137); Išo‘dad, p. 114,14–17.

[283] Diyarb., p. 55,4–18; Theod. b. Koni, p. 103,13–104,17; Išo‘dad, p. 114,6–9.11–14.

Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išoʿdad, "regret" means "considered", i.e. God considered that He had made men for good things yet they turned to evil.[285]

Details of the building of the ark are omitted by Narsai yet appear in Diyarbakır and Išoʿdad. These concern the type of wood used (ܒܪܘܐ) and the function and location of the beams (ܬܩ̈ܕܢܐ).[286] Similarly, Narsai neither specifies the division of the inhabitants of the ark among the three stories nor does he enumerate the progression of the flood or the difference between the solar and lunar calendars. These details are provided by many of the later commentators who also include debates about whether or not the animals ate or drank and where the food and water came from.[287]

The absence of the use of symbolism for the dove and the olive branch distinguishes Narsai, Diyarbakır and Išoʿdad from Ephrem and Išoʿ bar Nun on the other. Of the later East-Syrian exegetes, it is only Išoʿ bar Nun who sees the compassion of the Father in the olive branch as well as a reference to Zerubabel and Joshua the priest (Zach. 4,11-16).[288] This is not the first instance in which Išoʿ bar Nun differs from the other commentators on typological matters. He also discerns a double sign of the cross in the four women and four men who entered the ark.[289]

Conditions improved after Noah and those with him left the ark. One of the benefits granted to men was the permission to eat meat. It was in fact for this reason, according to Narsai, Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išoʿdad, that so many (pure) animals were saved along with Noah.[290] Išoʿdad closely resembles Narsai in saying that had earlier generations been given laws concerning meat, Noah would have kept the law beyond all and no new law would have been necessary. Moreover, the covenant would no longer entail anything new. The reason for the pouring out of the animals' blood prior to consumption (Gen. 9,4) varies from one exegete to the next. The first reason

---

284 Narsai, Hom. II, st. 183-186; Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 58,18-21).

285 Diyarb., p. 56,1-11; Theod. b. Koni, p. 99,19-110,1.13-17; Išoʿdad, p. 115,22-29 and 116,12-14.

286 Diyarb., p. 56,27-57,9; Išoʿdad, p. 117,12-15.22-26.

287 Cf. Diyarb., p. 57,18-20; Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,3-5; Išoʿdad, p. 118,3-5 for the three stories of the ark. For the dimensions of the flood see Diyarb., p 59,6-15; Išoʿdad, p. 120,4-9; Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,9-11. For the lunar and solar years cf. Diyarb., p. 60,7-10; Theod. b. Koni, p. 105,11-12 and Išoʿdad, p. 120,26-29.

288 Išoʿ b. Nun, Q. XVI, fol. 10r,8-16.

289 Išoʿ b. Nun, Q. XV, fol. 9v,14-10r,7.

290 Narsai, Hom. II, st. 283-286.781-792; Diyarb., p. 61,13-15; Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,18-23; Išoʿdad, p. 123,18-23.

provided by Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išoʿdad is to restrain people from worshipping animals. The second reason, with which Narsai concurs, is that men not kill each other.[291] Here Išoʿdad follows Narsai once more when adding that man is God's image and thus anyone who kills him will be punished according to man's honor.[292]

The rainbow in the clouds functioned as a sign of peace, says Narsai. But how? Diyarbakır, Theodore bar Koni and Išoʿdad, like Narsai, say that the bow was unstrung.[293] While God was not in need of a sign, it served to prevent men from falling into despair in fear. The three later commentators also explain how the rainbow appears and why it produces colors, once more a "scientific" detail not reproduced by Narsai. The question as to whether or not the rainbow was a new sign is probably raised because of Theodore's claim that nothing new came into being after the sixth day of creation.[294] Similar discussions arise with regard to the tunics with which Adam and Eve were clothed after the transgression and the ram/lamb of Gen. 22.

The final verses of Gen. 9 dealing with Noah's drunkenness, his blessing and curses are of interest to all of our commentators. Diyarbakır (followed by Išoʿdad) says that Noah was the first to cultivate the vine.[295] Išoʿdad, like Narsai and Cosmas, adds that Noah was inexperienced in drinking wine.[296] He also includes many more reasons for the intoxicating effect of the wine e.g. Noah didn't dilute it with water. Ephrem alone claims that Noah had drunk wine prior to the flood but that six years had since passed.[297] This divergence is undoubtedly related to the fact that Ephrem is the only exegete of those under consideration here who believed that the disruption of seasons was limited to the year preceding the flood. Whereas the question of why Canaan and not Ham was cursed is raised by Ephrem as well as all the others, Narsai seems to ignore the problem. The solutions offered are: 1) Ham was blessed in the ark and so couldn't be cursed. 2) Canaan saw Noah's nakedness first. 3) Ham was made to

---

291 Narsai, Hom. II, st. 793-796; Diyarb., p. 61,9-25; Theod. b. Koni, p. 107,23 and 108,4-5; Išoʿdad, p. 123,24-124,9. The parallel drawn by Diyarb. between the human soul and the blood which takes the place of the soul in animals is derived from Theodore (Staab, *Pauluskomm.*, p. 195 and Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p. 120-122, fol. 31r,9-31v,1).

292 Išoʿdad, p. 125,3-8; Narsai, Hom. II, st. 789-800.

293 Diyarb., p. 62,9-25; Išoʿdad, p. 126,22-127,4; Theod. b. Koni, p. 106,25-107,10.

294 Theodore (Sachau, p. 30,15-22).

295 Diyarb., p. 63,8-10.

296 Išoʿdad, p. 127,19-21; Narsai, Hom. II, st. 829-832.

297 Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 63,8-10).

suffer through his son's curse, just as Noah suffered on account of his son.[298] Narsai's long treatment of Noah's blessings and curse is presented summarily in later works. All agree that the formulation of the blessing is not that of blessings, nor was the curse a curse. Canaan never served Israel, nor did the Gibeonites.[299] The blessing points to Christ who would be called Lord and king. Moreover, the curse proves God's prescience for He was aware of the fact that men would enslave each other and revealed this in advance. Once more, Išo'dad embellishes upon these remarks, noting that God is the Lord of slaves and freemen. This too has been culled, without acknowledgment, from Narsai's homilies.[300]

After having moved from the east, a united mankind began to build a tower (Gen. 11,1f.). Which men moved from which eastern area? Opinions are divided, Narsai, Cosmas and Išo'dad referring to the post-flood generation who moved from where they first disembarked land inwards.[301] Diyarbakır, on the other hand, considers east to be the area near Paradise whence Noah departed.[302] Why did they build a tower? Impudence or haughtiness is the first reason[303] and immaturity the second. Išo'dad and Theodore bar Koni add fear of the flood to this list as well as the desire to make a name by warring against God. While the ideas expressed by Išo'dad are similar to Diyarbakır, the wording is once more Narsai's.[304] God's words in Gen. 11, 6 ("Nothing they have a mind to do will be beyond their reach") are generally interpreted to mean "they will continue to labor and won't cease until their will is accomplished". God's dividing is in this sense truly an act of grace, for He saved them from perdition. Moreover, God's plans were also accomplished because it was His intention to have men occupy the entire earth.[305] In descending to divide the people, God addresses those with

---

[298] Diyarb., p. 63,23-64,5 and Išo'dad, p. 138,10-16.18-22 provide all three answers. Theod. b. Koni, p. 108,19-23, reports the second two.

[299] Diyarb., p. 64,12-15; Theod. b. Koni, p. 109,7-10; Išo'dad, p. 129,11-16. Išo'dad, like Cosmas, adds the Gibeonites to the Canaanites. He is also the one who, like Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 65,7-8), claims that the Canaanites did serve Israel under Joshua.

[300] Išo'dad, p. 129,28-29; Narsai, Hom. 1, Mingana, I, p. 6.

[301] Narsai, Hom. IV, st. 71-72; Išo'dad, p. 136,12-18.

[302] Diyarb., p. 67,23-25.

[303] Cf. Cosmas and Cyrus above. So too Diyarb., p. 67,22 and 68,17-18; Išo'dad, p. 138,4 and 137,14.24-25; Theod. b. Koni, p. 111,6-7.

[304] Išo'dad, p. 137,29-138,3-7; Theod. b. Koni, p. 111,11-15; Diyarb., p. 68,12-13; Narsai, Hom. IV, st. 138-139.

[305] So Diyarb., p. 68,16-17; Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,11-12 and Išo'dad, p. 137,12-14.21-23. Once more, Išo'dad also presents Ephrem's opinion (Tonneau, p. 66,11-12) who says that that which they wanted to avoid will occur.

Him with words "Come, let us descend". This is considered to be a reference to the Trinity parallel to that of Gen. 1,26. None except Narsai explains what is meant by God's having descended. Lastly, a connection is made between the division at Babel and the gift of tongues at Pentecost.[306] While Narsai says that the original language of man was preserved, he does not tell us which it was. Here he differs from others who debate whether the first language was Hebrew or Syriac.[307]

To conclude, there are many points of agreement between the later East-Syrian commentators and Narsai. These include the implementation of God's predetermined plans by various means so that men are instructed along the way as well as many lesser details. At times Narsai agrees with Theodore bar Koni rather than with Diyarbakır. Išo'dad, in the course of presenting varied and contradictory opinions, often reproduces Narsai's words verbatim without mentioning his source.

---

[306] Narsai, Hom. IV, st. 492-505; Išo' b. Nun, Q. XVIII, fol. 11r,6-16; Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,10-13.

[307] Narsai, Hom. IV, st. 388-389; Diyarb., p. 68,24-69,16; Theod. b. Koni, p. 112,21-114,2; Išo'dad, p. 134,26-136,11.

Chapter Five

The Solid Reality is Christ

The homilies presented thus far have been seen to follow biblical chronology from Enoch through the tower of Babel, although the number of biblical verses commented upon varies greatly from one homily to the next. The final two homilies to be dealt with here, Hom. V "On the Fashioning of the Temporal Tabernacle" and Hom. VI "On the Brazen Serpent",[1] disrupt the sequence established in that they treat not the story of Abraham (Gen. 11,26f.) but Ex. 25 and Nu. 21 respectively, as their titles would indicate. The subject matter of these homilies, on the other hand, may certainly be said to be continuous with that of the four preceding homilies on Genesis in as much as the fashioning of the tabernacle and the serpent are not viewed by Narsai as isolated historical events[2] but, like the translations of Enoch and Elijah and Noah's blessings, point symbolically to future events. As such a study of Hom. V and VI both independently and in conjunction with other homilies including the aforesaid, may shed light on the function assigned to symbols and types by our author.

5.1 The Renewal of Creation (Homily V)

The introductory section of Hom. V (st. 1–60) refers the reader immediately to the homilies on creation. Whereas in the latter Moses is said to have recorded the creation story in order to teach men that God is the Creator,[3] here God is said to have created a second creation through Moses. The purpose of this recapitulation is likewise to teach men that God is the Creator of the first creation and to demonstrate His artistic force to the angels as He had done in the beginning. The tabernacle, meant to serve as a portrayal (ܦܘܡܢܐ) of the earthly and heavenly worlds, was depicted on Mt. Sinai in a likeness or resemblance (ܕܡܘܬܐ) which didn't exist. It was thus without structure and immaterial, envisioned by Moses in his mind. As such, its fashioning resembled that of the beginning, when God created something out of nothing. The division

---

[1] These are homilies 57 and 55 of Mingana's list.

[2] In a sense, no event may be considered isolated, for each forms part of the experience which leads to humanity's gradual progression.

[3] Gignoux, II, 1–22 and III, 1–30. See above, ch. 2.1.

of creation into two dwelling places by the firmament is represented by the curtain dividing the tabernacle into two. The outer tabernacle filled with earthly furnishings, parallels the temporal world with its transitory things. The inner tabernacle, like the future world, contains the spiritual. Thus the fashioning of the tabernacle reveals God's greatness as the Creator ex nihilo of two worlds.

A transition (st. 61–72) in which first God and then Moses, in a series of stichs commencing with "O!"("Hail!") (ܐܘ), are praised as painters and fashioners, leads to an extensive section on the outer and inner tabernacles (st. 72–144.145–166). A brief introduction to this section reiterates the division of the tabernacle into bodily and spiritual things, this time extending the analogy between the present and future lives and the inner and outer tabernacles to man's two-fold composition of body and spirit (st. 87–88). This duality serves to classify the objects in the "Holy" and "Holy of Holies" according to bodily and spiritual needs, thereby identifying body and soul with the temporal and perpetual of the introduction. Beyond this, a link is established with the divisions contained in successive sections of the homily: Christ's humanity and divinity as symbolized by the gold plate, limited and complete expiation, the shadow and the truth and finally, Christ's full humanity in body and soul.

The first contrast made between the outer and inner sanctuary is that of the perpetual access granted the body to the outer area vs. the entrance of the soul into the "Holy of Holies" through the high priest. Narsai qualifies this by adding that even the high priest was a symbol (ܐܪܙܐ) of spiritual ones. The sustenance of the body was found in the outer tabernacle, consisting of the sacrifices on the altars, the shewbread and the gold candelabrum. The first represents expiation, the second man's nourishment and the third the luminaries. Additional reference to earthly life is to be found both in the disposition of the bread in rows and the structure of the lamp in six branches projected from a central stand. The two rows of six breads are the twelve months and seasons of the year and the seven lights are the constitution of the year in weeks of seven days. The four corners of the earth are pointed to by the positioning of the tabernacle. The setting of the bread in the north and the lamp in the south correspond to the germination of seeds and fruits in the rays of the sun. The mention of the sun serves as a transition to the description of the inner tabernacle where there is no light, just as there is no sun in the heavenly fashioning. This notion is be found both in Narsai's homilies on creation[4] and in Hom. 44 "On the Renewal of Creation".[5] In the beginning God stretched out the watery firmament as a roof and set the luminaries in it to illuminate the earthly dwelling place. At the renewal of creation, which will occur suddenly like the first while having been determined aforetime by God like the first,[6] neither labor nor bodily sustenance will be necessary. Therefore, the course of the sun and the moon and the germination of plants will be obviated. All irrational beings will be enveloped in the earth from whence they came, the sun and the moon reverting back to the light of the first day for eternity.[7] Like the future world, then, the objects of the inner tabernacle are spiritual and represent both past and future, compassion and judgment. The incense is pure confession, the high priest's entrance - expiation, the urn and the staff are the manna and priestly election of the past and the seraphim are the heavenly ministry and immortal life.[8] Lastly, the gold plate above the ark named "expiation" was but the symbol (ܐܪܙܐ) of expiation, designated thus metaphorically. The name "covering" points to Christ's bodiliness and "expiation" to the Word or Force of the Divine Essence dwelling in the body (Rom. 3,25).

That we have arrived at the crux of the matter is demonstrated by the further structure of the homily. In st. 167–200 the expiation of the covering is related to the expiation offered by Christ, followed by a series of questions addressed to the Jew[9] as to why the covering alone expiated and prophesied (st. 201–222). These commence with (ܠ)ܡܢܐ and ܠܡܢ. The cumulative attribution of these properties to the covering but to no one or nothing else, must therefore be considered purposeful and endowed with additional, i.e. symbolic meaning, says Narsai. This he explains in st. 227–242 where other objects in the tabernacle are related to Christ's coming and mission. A shorter series of questions (st. 243–250) once more beginning with (ܠ)ܡܢܐ/ ܠܡܢ is again accompanied by an answer, this time extensive (st. 251–295). Not only does the sanctuary and its symbols point to the truth, historical events such as

---

[4] Gignoux I, 55-104; III, 139-156.

[5] Mingana, II, p. 55-72.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 56-57.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[8] The connection between the seraphim and immortal life is probably related to the sanctification ("holy, holy, holy") which they offered in Isaiahs's vision (Is. 6) and which is repeated at baptism and will chanted continuously in the second state. See below, 5.5.

[9] This first becomes evident in st. 215 and 225. The first interrupts the questioning in the form of an appeal to the Jew to consider his own scriptures. The second introduces the symbolic meaning of the tabernacle.

the abolishment of idolatry and acceptance of Christ by many show that He is the one to whom scripture attested. Not only do the symbols point to Christ, it is on His account that the symbols have come to be. Thus the sprinkling of the blood of a dumb lamb prepared the way before Christ, whose blood would truly redeem mankind (st. 291–294). From the specific fashionings in the tabernacle Narsai returns to the more general division of the tabernacle into the bodily and the spiritual, moving backwards towards his initial description of and admiration for the likeness which Moses delineated so accurately. Here too a group of stichs introduced by "O!" (ܐܘ ܟܡܐ) is followed by a sequence asking "Who would not" (ܡܢ ܠܐ). One important difference may be discerned between this final description and the initial one. The "Holy" and "Holy of Holies" no longer correspond to the structure of men in general, but to the fashioning of one man - Christ - in body and soul (st. 295–300). For it is by means of His two-fold structure that Christ will gather both men and angels to Him. So too the final section of the homily (st. 357f.) ends with God the Creator being praised by His creation through Christ's body according to whose fashioning, in body and soul, Moses fashioned the tabernacle.

5.2 More than an Appearance (Homily VI)

In introducing Hom. VI "On the Brazen Serpent", Narsai looks back to a positive and central event in history - God's promise to Abraham to redeem his offspring from slavery - thereby underlining the ingratitude of the people which subsequently led to their punishment. The introductions to Narsai's homilies are often retrospective, whether positively, as in Hom. II where God shows His love for creation by creating man in His image, or negatively, as in Hom. I where the creation is in mourning due to man's fall.[10] Jansma has suggested[11] with regard to the homilies on creation, "On Enoch and Elijah" and "On the Flood" (which he considers to be a series), that the events recalled are those with which the previous homily ended. I would propose instead that our author presents essential stages in the Divine Economy, whereby God's predetermined plans are carried out from one generation to the next. So too the redemption of the Israelites from Egypt is the fulfillment of (the first part of) God's promise to Abraham. Not recorded here but understood is that through Abraham the peoples were to be blessed. Thus despite the hatefulness of the people, God liberated them but caused them to dwell in the desert, so that they might abandon their wicked behavior. Utilizing a word-play, Narsai explains God's pedagogical insights: the desert (ܚܘܪܒܐ) was meant to pacify (ܕܥܡܢ) the vacuity (ܚܘܪܒܐ) of their minds, something which a cultivated place (ܥܡܪܐ) would not have been able to bring about (st. 9–14). Moreover, God made the circumstances even more favorable for change by working wonders including providing them with manna and quail (Ex. 16,11–16), a rock which gave them to drink (Ex. 17,1–7), the cloud for shade and the light-filled column (Ex. 13,21–22; 1 Cor. 10,1–5). Yet while the Israelites enjoyed all the aforesaid benefits, they failed to perceive who it was who had provided them and they persisted in their ungrateful behavior (cf. 1 Cor. 10,9).

---

[10] The flood which follows the positive opening of Hom. II is, of course, terrible while the negative opening of Hom. I is reversed by the hope provided by the translations of Enoch, Elijah and Christ's ascension.

[11] Jansma, "Homilies on Creation", p. 210.

Although rational beings are capable of using their discernment and following God's will – the key to the Paradise story, it will be recalled[12] – it is often the irrational beings who obey God and warn mankind. So too Noah's ark and the gathering of the animals are said to have cried out against the sinners while the waves served as God's instruments in Hom. II. In Hom. VI the venemous serpents and the desert were pacified while the Israelites were not. Because "sin opened the door of the commandment" (st. 53)[13] the serpents were allowed to resume their custom of attacking men. It was God's wise plan to temper the venom of their hearts with the venom of the serpents who were more discerning than the discerning ones. He too restrained the latter and then allowed them to sting.

The people perforce realized that the serpents' attack was of their own doing and they cried out for mercy. God responded, not because they had persuaded Him, but because of the love He felt and He commanded Moses to make a serpent. The lifeless serpent was raised up in the midst of the camp and all who looked at it were healed from the bites of the living serpents. The fact that a mute, lifeless thing which was unable to discern the Force working through it, was able to bringing about such healing amazes the writer. Narsai proceeds to extol the cast serpent in a series of stichs commencing with "O!" (st. 149–162). This is followed by two groups of questions, the first in troduced by "Forsooth!" ܐܪܐ (st. 163–170) and the second by a variety of interrogative particles, e.g. ܡܢ(ܠ/ܠܐ), ܐܝܟܢ and ܐܢ (st. 179–198). At this stage it is

---

[12] See above, ch. 2.1

[13] Perhaps a reference to Gen. 4,7 where Cain was warned that sin was crouching at the door.

the listener and not the Jew who is invited to inquire into the matter of the serpent. Whose force worked through the serpent? And why did it heal only if one gazed upon it? Why specifically was this lifeless one of benefit to rational beings and not the holy vessels or the sanctuary? The questions concern the particular choice of the serpent, just as in Hom. V the expiation attributed specifically to the golden plate is examined. Once more a special meaning must be designated to the serpent and this is found in st. 217–263: God was going to heal men through a man and He depicted this beforehand in the serpent. This He did so that men not doubt when Christ came. The parallels between the events are manifold. Just as the serpent healed through faith, so Christ will heal those who have faith. Christ would be hung on Golgotha and Moses hung the snake – His symbol – amidst the camp. Christ was going to come at the time when iniquity was great on earth and so the serpent arrived at a time of iniquity. A lifeless one revived the people so that they not doubt when a mortal would do the same. If mute bronze could cure, how much the more a man! These are precisely the arguments used in Hom. V with regard to the expiation of the covering. And so too here, Narsai addresses himself first to the Jew and then to the heretic, both of whom have wronged the mystery (ܐܪܙܐ) of the incarnation. The Jew has denied that redemption has taken place through Christ, and the heretic won't admit that it has taken place through a man. But the serpent is the symbol of Christ's exaltedness and prepared the way for man's exaltation through a man. While the serpent healed bodily members, a man removed both pain and debts.

Narsai interrupts his rebuke of the Jew in order to explain why God made use of a serpent (st. 315–335). That very thing which caused Adam to err would revive him so that the demons, for whom the snake had served as an instrument (Gen. 3,1f.), were put to shame. They mourned[14] not only on account of the serpent, but because of Christ and His healing. They, as opposed to the Jew and the heretic, recognized the resemblance between the symbol (ܐܪܙܐ) and the truth (ܩܘܫܬܐ). Narsai once more summarizes the workings of Christ in a section beginning with "Forsooth!". It is impossible, he says, to honor a brazen serpent but deny exaltedness to Christ, the second Adam. For if not for Him, the snake would be nothing. Just like the gold plate, the snake is but a symbol of redemption and a shadow (ܛܠܠܝܬܐ), while the solid reality is Christ (Col. 2,17). The homily concludes (st. 369–378) with praise of the snake ("O!") which develops into praise of the Creator. For the serpent was an envoy and a herald whose goodness was not of itself but from the Force of the Creator who, in love, reproached the Adversary and revived the people.

---

[14] Their mourning is the counterpart of the angels' bereavement at Adam's fall. See, for example, the opening of Hom. I.

5.3 The Typology of Homilies V and VI

Nowhere in Narsai's extant oeuvre will the reader discover a theoretical treatise on the function of types and symbols. Hom. 2 "On the Divine Revelations which Came to the Forefathers and to the Prophets"[15] traces the various means by which God, in love, revealed His Hiddenness throughout the generations from Adam until Paul. The number of personalities and events selected by Narsai is limited and that in itself may yield some information as to his view on the relationship between the events prior to Christ's coming and those after it, between the Old and the New Testaments and between the present and future worlds. However, before embarking upon a general survey of types and symbols in Narsai's works, a closer look at Narai's use of symbols in Homilies V and VI will be had.

The two words most frequently used to express the relationship between two modes of reality[16] are ܕܡܘܬܐ and ܐܪܙܐ and variations thereof (e.g. ܕܡܘܢܐ, ܐܪܙܢܝܬ). The first, ܕܡܘܬܐ, has usually been translated in this study as "likeness" or "resemblance" but not "image" which has been reserved for the translation of ܨܠܡܐ. Whereas both terms are found in Pesh. Gen. 1,26, "Let us make man in our image (ܒܨܠܡܢ) according to our likeness (ܐܝܟ ܕܡܘܬܢ)", man and Christ are almost always referred to as God's (very) image (ܨܠܡܗ [ܨܠܡ]). In Hom. V "On the Tabernacle", God is said to have depicted (ܨܪ) the likenesses of the temporal tabernacle and shown them to His servant Moses (st. 8). That likeness may be material or immaterial is clear from st. 19–22 where God depicted a "likeness which was not, as if it were" and "likenesses without composition", that men understand the creation at the beginning as one in which something came to be from nothing. From the statement that the likenesses "were not" and were "without composition", one may conclude that likenesses may have composition and thus may be seen not only with the mind, as Moses saw them, but with the eye as well, as the people saw them once they were given structure. No clear difference may be establshed between ܕܡܘܬܐ and ܕܡܘܢܐ, as the latter is used in st. 36.95–96 148–149.313 and 315–318 where one may expect or has even found ܕܡܘܬܐ: God depicted the dwelling of the world, so that Moses resemble or imitate Him (ܢܕܡܐ) and make the tabernacle a likeness (ܕܡܘܢܐ) of the worlds (st. 36). Moses is to make according to that spiritual likeness (ܕܡܘܢܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܐ) which God depicted (st. 40). The likeness (ܕܡܘܢܗ) of the outer tabernacle was delineated symbolically (st. 95) as opposed to the spiritual way in which the inner tabernacle was depicted (st. 93), and its perpetual entrance corresponded to its likeness (ܕܡܘܢܗ) (st. 96). In st. 95–96 it would seem that ܕܡܘܢܐ refers to the tabernacle itself, or its actual form and not to a likeness of the tabernacle. The likeness (ܕܡܘܢܐ) which Moses likened, likens greatly (st. 313). He was told to look and make in the manner of the likeness (ܒܐܣܟܡ ܕܕܡܘܢܐ) which God depicted (st. 315) and he did this, imitating the likeness (ܕܡܘܬܐ) which was of nothing and had no likeness (ܕܡܘܬܐ) (st. 316–318). Further occurrences of ܕܡܘܬܐ are st. 136, 309–310, 328–329 and 376. Here it is the candelabrum which is disposed in the likeness of the week (st. 136), serving in the likeness of the sun (st. 309–310). The image of Moses's likenesses (ܨܠܡ ܕܡ̈ܘܬܟ) were very exact and it's likeness is like (ܕܡܐ ܕܡܘܢܗ) that nothing shown to him (st. 329–330). In the latter, the various likenesses seem to form a total picture or likeness. Finally, the tabernacle is said to have been depicted in two according to the likeness of a whole man, existing in body and soul (st. 375–376). Here it is not simply that a two-part division is being paralleled. For the two sections of the tabernacle are filled with bodily and spiritual things so that "likeness" also consists of a likeness of detail.

The use of ܕܡܘܬܐ in Hom. VI is limited when compared with its use in Hom. V, and it is seemingly replaced by ܚܝܠܬܐ, a term to be discussed below. In st. 24, the column of light which accompanied the Israelites in the desert is said to have been fixed in the likeness of a candelabrum. Further, Moses cast the likeness of the reptiles without understanding (st. 115) and hung the harmful likeness in the midst of the people (st. 118). The verb "to be like" is also used with regard to the cast serpent, Moses having structured it to be like (ܕܚܘܝܐ ܕܡܐ) the live serpent entirely. Lastly, God revealed the likeness (of the serpent, but perhaps also Christ's likeness) on account of iniquity, in the very likeness (i.e. imitating that which would be) of His revealing Christ at the time when iniquity would be great among the peoples (st. 249–250). Why likeness is preferred to "as" (ܐܝܟ) or "according to" (ܠܦܘܬ) in the case of the column of light is not clear. As for the cast serpent, it is surely a likeness, albeit lifeless, of the harmful snakes which terrified the Israelites.

---

[15] Mingana, I, p. 29–56. See ch. 2.4 above.

[16] The description of a symbol as expressing the relationship between modes of reality is derived from Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 42.

The term ܐܪܙܐ, symbol, occurs more frequently than any other typological term in Narsai's homilies and this is equally true for Homilies V and VI. It is most often used in the sense of a symbol of Christ or actions, such as expiation, to be effectuated wholly by Him. It is juxtaposed to fulfillment (ܫܘܡܠܝܐ), accomplishment or perfection in deeds/reality (ܢܓܡܘܪ ܒܚܝܠ ܒܣܘܥܪܢܐ) and truth (ܫܪܪܐ/ܫܪܪܘܬܐ). As such the symbol is not permanently effective, nor is it reality itself, but rather a shadow (ܛܠܠܝܬܐ) of that which is anticipated (e.g. by the law – ܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܐ) and hidden. The names thus attributed to a symbol are often called metaphorical (ܫܐܝܠܐ). That which the symbol brings about resembles the activities of the symbolized and makes sense only when understood in the light of the latter. Lastly, a symbol serves as a guide (ܗܕܝܐ), an envoy (ܐܝܙܓܕܐ) and a herald (ܟܪܘܙܐ) leading to or proclaiming that which it symbolizes. Aside from the meaning "symbol", ܐܪܙܐ does occasionally mean "(cultic) mystery" especially in regard to the incarnation or the sacraments.

Examples of the use of ܐܪܙܐ as indicated in Hom. V and VI:

A. ܐܪܙܐ as symbol in general
V,94 The high priest entered the inner sanctuary as a symbol of the spiritual beings (in that the inner sanctuary was the likeness of spiritual life).
V,95 The likeness of the outer sanctuary was delineated symbolically.
V,125 The candelabrum was looking at the shewbread with its flames as the symbol of the luminaries.
V,163 The ark was the symbol of the heavenly ministry.
V,228 The inner sanctuary was the symbol of the spiritual fashioning.
VI,200 either it (the cast serpent) is something, or the symbol of something is hidden in its appearance.

B. ܐܪܙܐ as symbol referring to Christ
V,168-9 Not that it (the gold plate) expiates, but rather it is the symbol of the Expiator. The symbol of expiation was hidden in the legal disposition and it was awaiting the time when the Expiator of debts would reveal it.
V,203-4 Why was it (the plate) set in the "Holy of Holies" like a holy one, disclosing the symbol of hidden things and the expiation of debts.
V,229 The altar of your offerings is the symbol of that offering on behalf of our lives.
V,237 Into the sanctuary on high the symbol of our salvation was going to enter.
V,265 All the just were consoled by the symbol of His coming.

V,273 Him did the high priest worship symbolically before that plate.
VI,168 Was perhaps the symbol of the true physician hidden in you (the cast serpent)?
VI,235 The symbol of Him who is coming did He depict in the appearance of the mute one.
VI,248 He (God) taught Moses to hang up His (Christ's) symbol in the midst of the people.

C. ܐܪܙܐ symbol as shadow
V,230 Your expiation too is but a shadow of the expiation of debts.
VI,357-60 Nothing is that dumb serpent compared to Him, and Paul testifies to this for he called it the shadow of something. "The law contains only a shadow, and it was not the truth which is in solid reality."
VI,361-2 The solid reality is Christ who is true and perfect in body and soul, and His shadow is the serpent which served as the symbol of His redemption.

D. ܐܪܙܐ as symbol vs. truth, reality or fulfillment
V,171-2 The mute plate was longing for the rational plate, for the time when it would come and accomplish (ܢܓܡܘܪ) its symbol effectively (ܒܚܝܠ ܒܣܘܥܪܢܐ).
V,187 The Force of the Creator gave force to the symbol and its fulfillment (ܫܘܡܠܝܗ).
V,254 As with a finger it (the sanctuary) points through the symbols to the truth which is dawning (ܫܪܪܐ ܕܕܢܚ).
VI,227 It (the Divine Force) prepared the way symbolically through it (the cast serpent) prior to the deeds (ܩܕܡ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ).
VI,333-4 At Him and at the serpent did they (demons) wonder and marvel, about how much the symbol resembles the truth in its deeds (ܕܡܐ ܐܪܙܐ ܠܫܪܪܘܬܐ ܒܚܝܠ ܣܘܥܪܢܘܗܝ).

E. ܐܪܙܐ as mystery
VI,284 For you (heretic) have wronged the mystery of the incarnation in his (the Jew's) likeness.

Surprisingly, the use of image (ܨܠܡܐ) and type (ܛܘܦܣܐ) is minimal in the two homilies. In Hom. V, st. 329–332, the image of Moses's likenesses is said to be very accurate, resembling that nothing shown to him. Luminous is the color which the Spirit mixed in his words, its hue resembling the seemly hue of the image of the worlds. Here image is specifically used in the sense of a pictorial image produced by a painter, as the association with color and hues indicates. Similarly, both God and Moses are called painters in the creation homilies,[17] mixing colors and hues to create or write about creation. The term "image" is not found in Hom. VI; neither is "type", which occurs twice in Hom. V. In st. 43 Moses is commanded to make one tabernacle according to the type by which God made heaven and earth. A diversity of terms is used in st. 36–44, all of which are related to each other yet not identical, and it is within this context that type may be defined. Moses is first told to imitate the dwelling place depicted by the Hint and make a tabernacle in the likeness (ܕܘܡܝܐ) of the worlds (st. 35–36). The Creator showed Moses an appearance (ܚܙܬܐ) which resembles something (st. 38) and told him to make according to that spiritual likeness (ܕܘܡܝܐ) (st. 39–40). Moses is to depict a portrait (ܦܘܣܝܐ) of the two worlds and set it before onlookers to examine it (st. 41–42). Lastly the tabernacle is to be according to the type in which God made heaven and earth and Moses is to follow this model. For this purpose he has been supplied with a likeness, in this case nothing or no more than an appearance, so that he make a likeness out of something. This likeness will serve as a portrait, capable of being studied by others. The only other occurrence of type is Hom. V, st. 105–6: "The entire course of the year was in it (the candelabrum) and the force of the elements was hidden in the types depicted in it." Here "type" may refer to a topographic model of the sun in the south shining on the crops in the north.

Lastly appearance, ܚܙܬܐ, is manifold in Hom. VI and is attested four times in Hom. V. In the latter, st. 22 and 38 refer to that which God depicted for Moses on Mt. Sinai. This is also the case for st. 321 where the wondrous appearance, seen by the seer of hidden things (Moses) is said to be beyond the thought of earthly beings. Similarly (st. 339–340), Moses, astute in seeing hidden things, applied his faculties to examine that which is without appearance. From the last stich cited one might conclude that a ܚܙܬܐ is normally visible and palpable, even if not endowed with any power of its own. In Hom. VI, the term is consistently applied to the cast serpent with the exception of st. 240 where the cure provided by the cast serpent is meant to deter investigation into the appearance which is near. The latter is surely (the crucified) Christ, a man by whom men would be cured.[18]

Summarizing now the correspondences between Hom. V and VI: The gold plate atop of the ark and the brazen serpent both accomplished amazing things. The former procured expiation and the latter healing. What these two irrational, inanimate things brought about can hardly be attributed to their own doings but rather to God's force working in them. A snake and not Moses or his scriptures or offerings healed. So too it was solely the gold plate and the cherubim which expiated. Neither the cure nor the expiation were permanent and as such the snake and the covering are symbols and shadows of the true and lasting relief and expiation from sin which were to come. The fulfillment of the symbols is in Christ as attested in Jo. 3,14–15 ("Just as Moses raised up the serpent in the desert, so the son of man is going to be raised up") and Rom. 3,25 ("For God designed him to be the means of expiating sins by his sacrificial death"). Moreover, says Narsai, it is precisely Christ's humanity which was able to redeem mankind. Knowing that men would doubt the ability of a man to save others, God quelled debate in advance by means of the snake and the plate which not only pointed to Christ but to His humanity as well. Thus the division of the tabernacle in two represents the bodily and the spiritual, man's body and soul and Christ's manhood in body and soul. As for the snake – if it could heal, why shouldn't a man accomplish the same? The broader circumstance provide additional proof of the functioning of the snake and the plate. For it was a mere glance at the serpent – but a glance in faith – which healed while the ministry of the tabernacle with its special regulations points to the difference between this world and the heavenly one where Christ entered first as high priest. In fact, the symbols not only announce Christ, they would be nothing without Him. Thus the symbols affirm Christ but are obscure when compared to Him. Moreover, He may be said to provide them with credibility. The symbol and the symbolized refer to each other while the working of Him who is symbolized (Christ) is far superior to that of the symbols (the snake and the tabernacle and the plate called "expiation").

The question which now arises is: are we justified when considering that which has been deduced thus far about Narsai's typology on the basis of Hom. V and VI as typical of his approach. The answer will be sought in a renewed consideration of two of the homilies presented earlier in this study.

---

[17] Gignoux, II, 7-12.

[18] Is Christ an appearance in the sense that His outward appearance as a man was troubling? Or is He an appearance, like the serpent, in that the force active in both was of God and not from themselves?

5.4 Types and Symbols in Homilies I and III

As in Hom. V and VI, ܐܪܙܐ firstly in the sense of "symbol" is the term most frequently employed in Hom. I "On Enoch and Elijah" and Hom. III "On Noah's Blessings". In the latter as well, the symbol discloses that which will happen in the future. Enoch's life and translation, for example, are said to cut off the way of death symbolically, prior to the time when it would be cut off in deed (I, st. 121–2). So too Elijah's ascension was not ascension (in that he didn't ascend to heaven but to Eden) but a symbol of ascension (I, st. 342) according to which mortals will ascend (I,344). The symbol of life and liberation was hidden in man's members (III,5) and Noah, who saw it in advance (III, st. 271) – the Lord having revealed the future to him symbolically (III, st. 191–2) – disclosed the symbol in his blessings. This was the symbol of man's salvation (III, st. 160) through Christ's coming (III, st. 344).

Secondly, the symbol is contrasted with reality so that not only was death yet to be cut off in deed (ܒܥܒ̈ܕܐ), but Noah too thanked the Lord for showing him the symbol before the reality (ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ) (III, st. 254). He incited his sons through the blessing and the curse, so that once the word was perfected in deed (ܡܠܬ ܠܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܟܕ: ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ) they acquire its wealth (III, st. 267–8).

Third, symbols are never wholly comprehended by men.[19] Thus Moses hinted at Enoch's translation yet didn't explain the reason for it (I, st. 251) and not even to Noah did God reveal the exact meaning of the symbol (III, st. 251–2). It is not that God is incapable of direct revelation, rather men are unable to benefit from it (III, st. 247–50). Here the theme of Divine pedagogics enters, for God instructs each generation according to its ability to understand. The earlier generations, therefore, hear a simple voice as opposed to later prophecy (I, st. 257–258).[20] Moreover, knowing that the nature of fools is such that it tends to devalue or reject that which is openly revealed, God put a veil over the words and events (cf. III, st. 243–3). Consequently Noah's words are said to be obscure (III, st. 91), labored (III, st. 91.229), hidden (III, st. 93.109) remote (III, st. 93) and dark (III, st. 232). Like the snake's healing and the covering's expiation, that which Noah saw in Shem was but the shadow (ܛܠܠܐ) of the truth (III, st. 253).

---

19 The angels, on the other hand, are said to have rejoiced at the news of man's renewal as symbolized in Enoch's ascension (I, st. 103–105), although not even they truly understood it.

20 Cf. Hom. I, st. 245–248.327–33.521–2; Hom. III, st. 402 and ch. 2.4 and 2.5 above.

Related to the symbol's function as narrator of future events are the epithets "guide"[21] and "herald"[22] and the apposite verbs "to show" or "prepare the way"[23] and proclaim.[24] This activity removes doubt so that the truth not be rejected as something strange once it is revealed, whether the truth be the revival of the dead,[25] the revelation of the Trinity in tongues[26] or man's healing and expiation by means of a man. Particular to Hom. I is that the symbol not only familiarizes man with future events, but serves as a guarantee and testimony. Enoch is a deposit (ܗܡܝܢܐ) for peace (I, st. 123), a pledge (ܡܫܟܢܐ) on behalf of the debtors who had not recompensed their debt (I, st. 130.133) and a guarantee (I, st. 137). Enoch and Elijah are a surety (ܪܗܒܘܢܐ) so that men not doubt the revival of the dead (I, st. 230), and guarantees (ܥܪ̈ܒܐ) of immortal life (I, st. 385–7). They assure the world of future things (I, st. 369–70) and peace (I, st. 379) and are deposits of peace (I, st. 371) in their purity. Christ is the guarantee (ܥܪܒܐ) and tried witness of the New Testament (I, st. 392) and Enoch, Elijah and Christ are three witnesses to the bill of life (I, st. 399). For completion's sake, I refer to the conclusion of Hom. IV where the tongues divided from the one tongue are called a surety for the revelation of the Divine hypostases in tongues (st. 490–1.496–7).

The use of "guarantee" and its synonyms in Hom. I seems to have replaced "likeness" or "resemblance" (ܕܡܘܬܐ) of Hom. V and "appearance" (ܚܙܬܐ) of Hom. VI. The prominence of ܕܡܘܬܐ in Hom. V is most likely due to the use of ܕܡܘܬܐ in Pesh. Ex. 25,9 and 25,40[27] according to which Moses was to make the tabernacle and its furnishings. The term's absence in Hom. I may indicate that the manner in which Enoch and Elijah were translated did not resemble Christ's, which in fact they did not; but their ascensions do point to His and as such are symbolic. The distinction in translation between Enoch and Elijah was expressed in spiritual likenesses, writes Narsai (I, st. 333–4), in order to reveal the distinction among men at the end of time.[28] Perhaps the

---

21 Hom. I, st. 156.233; Hom. III, st. 345.361.

22 Hom. III, st. 343.

23 Hom. I, st. 157.218.234.345.361.

24 Hom. I, st. 123.483; Hom. III, st. 64.

25 Hom. I, st. 229–30.

26 Acts 2, disclosed beforehand at the division of the tongues in Babel (Hom. IV, st. 494–5).

27 This is the translation of MT תבנית. LXX translates the first instance with παράδειγμα (Ex. 25,9) and the second with τύπον (Ex. 25,40). See 5.6 for Theodore's interpretation of these verses.

28 For the distinction between the just and the wicked who are rewarded and punished according to individual behavior even if divided into two basic groups, cf. Gignoux,

relationship is closer here between the symbol and the symbolized. The use of ܕܡܘܬܐ, however, is hardly more widespread in Hom. III. In st. 339–342 Noah, Abram, Isaac and Jacob are compared to painters of images of future things, depicting likenesses of things not revealed. "Image" is once more joined to "painter" in the case of Noah who is a painter who depicted the image of praise in his sons (III, st. 381–2). In both instances "image" is used quite generally and in Hom. I and II it is basically limited to Adam and man.

The remarks made concerning type and portrait in the discussion of typology in Hom. V and VI are valid here as well. In III, st. 253–260 the terms "shadow" and "truth" are followed by "mirror" by which God fixed the type before Noah's mind, so that he examined the rank of his son like a portrait. As for Hom. I, Enoch and Elijah's translations depict the type of our translation (I, st. 526). The latter might serve as further support for the argument that Narsai's use of differing terminology serves to underline the distinction made between Enoch, Elijah and Christ. Enoch and Elijah were men and their ascensions are closer to the ascension which men will eventually experience. As such the term ܛܘܦܣܐ is more appropriate here than for Christ's ascension which was not to Eden but to the heavenly dwelling place.

5.5 Further Investigation of Narsai's Symbolism

In the comparative study of Narsai's symbolism and typology above, I have included the homily "On Noah's Blessings" along with those "On the Translations of Enoch and Elijah", "On the Tabernacle" and "On the Brazen Serpent". The first, however, in predicting future events by *words*, differs from the others which announce that which is to come by that which they *are* or *do*. This distinction is usually drawn between prophecy and type[29] but it would be incorrect to insist on such a distinction in Narsai's work. As noted above, Hom. 2 "On the Divine Revelations which Came to the Forefathers and the Prophets" offers a survey of the revelations in history from Adam to Paul. These revelations form part of the instruction needed by man, who was created mortal in the temporal world, in order to progress toward maturity. They inform him both about God's great love for humanity and His Hiddenness as well as about the mystery of man's salvation in body and soul. Adam received a revelation concerning his own creation, for example, so that he understand God's greatness as Creator and his own magnification as God's image. Knowledge of God

---

"Doctrines eschatologiques", part 3, p. 32-31.

[29] Cf. Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, IV, transl., pref., p. VI–VII.

includes awareness of His omniscience and so in rejecting Cain's offering, God brought both the latter's hidden will and His own knowledge into the open. Similarly God reveals the wickedness of the people and threatens chastisement through the prophets. In general, revelations may be said to make manifest that which is hidden and as such, types (certainly many, if not all) may be considered a subcategory of revelations. This being the case, the following variegated group of homilies will enrich our discussion of symbolism: Hom. 72 "On Moses", Hom. 58 "On the Vision of the Seraphim which Isaiah Saw", Hom. 14 "On Jonah" and Hom. 38 "On the Sacraments of the Church and Baptism".[30]

Hom. 72 "On Moses" deals not only with the burning bush (as noted in ch. 2.4 above) but with the exodus from Egypt as well, and it is the latter which will concern us here. The Israelites, Narsai explains, were spared by the symbol of redemption (ܒܐܪܙ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ) when the angel of death passed over their houses at the slaying of the first-born. Despite the fact that the blood of a mute lamb was sprinkled by rational ones on their doorposts, it was able to deter an angel of fire and spirit.[31] As in Hom. V and VI, Narsai asks how this was possible: "Forsooth, mute one! Through what force were you able to vanquish a spiritual being?".[32] If the formulation of the question seems familiar to the reader, its answer too hardly comes as a surprise. The force of the lamb was not its own and that which came about was not enacted by it. For the angel saw the symbol of He who is coming in the blood of the lamb. It is rational blood which is going to liberate all people and the symbol of His coming was depicted beforehand in the mute blood at the people's redemption. The symbol of the truth liberated them and His commemoration (ܥܘܗܕܢܐ) was delineated on the fourteenth of Nisan so that His redemption not be mistaken. The symbol of this day was known to God prior to the creation and He redeemed the children of Abraham on that day so that they examine it.[33] All these arguments have been put forth elsewhere by our author. To these he adds that the Hidden Hint was urging Pharaoh to let the Israelites go so that the day commemorating the symbol not be obstructed.[34]

All the components required for the fixed pattern are present: the contrast between symbol and truth, the need for a symbol to assure future events so that men not doubt, and a correspondance of detail, i.e. the fourteenth of Nisan was the date of the redemption from Egypt and the redemption from corruptibility and enslavement to sin and death. Not only was the symbol determined by God in advance (it was not new thought which occured to Him), He made sure it took place on the fourteenth. The latter serves as a counterpart to the claim which is anticipated yet absent here, that the redemption would have been nothing were it not for the future redemption. The implication of both is that the type (or symbol) points to something greater than itself.

---

[30] These homilies may be found in Mingana, II, p. 288–302; Mingana, II, p. 131–144 and Mingana, I, p. 134–149 respectively. Cf. R.H. Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies*, p. 46–61 for a translation of Hom. 38.

[31] Mingana, II, p. 298–299.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 299.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] *Ibid.*

God makes use of symbols to make not only His salvation known but His being as well. Isaiah's vision of God standing in the temple being sanctified by the ranks of heavenly beings (Is. 6) is a case in point. Here the Trinity is proclaimed in hidden fashion as it was in Gen. 1,26 and Gen. 11,7.[35] Isaiah's vision, like Moses's, was in the mind and he entered the sanctuary with the angels in thought.[36] The celestial beings acquired six wings without structure in order to cover the senses which they had acquired quite suddenly and unaccustomedly. They cried out, "holy, holy, holy", thrice, revealing the three hypostases in the one Lordship over all.[37] If this is not so, Narsai queries in customary fashion, why did they sanctify no more and no less than three times? It is the angels' task to sanctify God continually so why do they limit their praise? In the beginning, when creation was fashioned, they learned of the one Being. Only after a while did they acquire understanding of the revelation of the hypostases.[38] The Hidden One revealed hidden things to them but not openly. They therefore repeated their praise thrice, symbolically, without understanding the meaning of that which they did.[39] Isaiah too failed to understand that which he saw and was filled with doubt because of the great wonder: angels fearful of the Lord and unable to fix their gaze upon Him. He knew not whether that which he saw was substantial (ܠܩܢܘܡܐ) or only a shadow.[40] Awe and love filled Isaiah's vision just as they filled the high priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement.[41] He was awed that

---

35 See above, ch. 4.4.
36 Mingana, II, p. 132.
37 *Ibid.*, p. 133.
38 According to Narsai, the early generation didn't know Christ or the Trinity. The latter was revealed only at the giving of the tongues (Acts 2).
39 *Ibid.*, p. 134.
40 *Ibid.*, p. 135.
41 Comp. Hom. V, st. 157-158.

he was found worthy of such a vision and was pained by the thought of his own iniquity and that of his people.[42] He longed for expiation and confessed his guilt even though not he, but his people were guilty. God sent his messenger - a fiery angel - with a fiery coal in order to burn the weed which had sprouted in the acres of Adam's sins. He took the coal with tongs and placed it on human lips yet Isaiah was not burned. This is a great wonder for the angel, a fiery being, dared not touch the coal yet a human was not burned and the bill of debts was erased.[43]

Again Narsai asks why purification occurred in this way, for fire causes harm! Moreover, why did the angel use tongs? Was he not stronger than a silent thing? And why did fire from the altar purify and not the blood of the offerings as usual among the Israelites?[44] That which the seraph did to Isaiah, like the expiation of the plate and the healing of the serpent, was new. But that which is hidden in the vision is not a symbol (ܐܪܙܐ) but the truth which causes symbols to pass (ܫܪܪܐ ܕܡܥܒܪ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ). The coal depicts the abolishment of the sacrifices of the law and the forgiveness of iniquity which is truer than that of the offerings.[45] It is dead yet revived him who died in sin, just as the sacrament of bread and wine are dead yet give life to those who partake of them. Potential doubters need only to consider the coal in order to understand that the body and blood of man can forgive sins. For if one grasps the vision of the shadow - the type of the truth - surely he can grasp the true body.[46]

In Hom. 38, "On the Sacraments of the Church and Baptism", Narsai reaffirms that which he said about Isaiah's vision in Hom. 58. The priests call out, "holy, holy, holy", as did the seraphim, disclosing in deed that which the prophet saw symbolically. Neither Isaiah's vision nor the coal was substantial (ܒܣܪ ܠܚܝܐ) but a symbol of the body and blood which, like the coal, remove the iniquity of mortality. The seraph didn't really hold out a material coal but the priest extends the bread as if holding fire with tongs. The hand of flesh which plucked the fruit in Eden iniquitously, clasps the spirit and extends the fruit of life to men.[47] The Force of the Spirit descends into the bread and winedeed

---

42 Mingana, II, p. 136. This too recalls the high priest on the Day of Atonement.
43 *Ibid.*, p. 138.
44 *Ibid.*, p. 139.
45 *Ibid.*, p. 140.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 141. Cf. Col. 2,17 and Hom. VI, st. 357-362.
47 Mingana, I, p. 352.

wine without descending and gives force to these that they give force.[48] The bread and wine are signs for the body, that it participate along with the mind in things not manifest. The bread allows the body to acquire hope of hidden things through that which is revealed. It is the way of hope of renewal which the sacraments prepare and men must look not at them but at the force which sanctifies them.[49]

Returning once more to God's promise to Abraham, the reader will recall Narsai's explanation of the chosenness of the people. God chose one heir as treasurer and steward of His repository so that through him He open His treasury of compassion to all nations.[50] The son – the Jews – was undeveloped and thought that the wealth belonged to him alone. Even the just walked on the way of the election of the people and disregarded the course to the peoples. So too Jonah fled when sent by God to the Ninevites, fearing the rejection and death of his people and the revival of the peoples.[51] He was to awaken the Ninevites sunk in sin and heal the pain of their iniquity. This he was to do with harshness of words followed by consolation and forgiveness like God's dealings with the generation of the flood and the tower of Babel. That the Ninevites would be forgiven increased Jonah's doubt, for not only the Jews but his words of doom might equally be rejected as false.[52] Thinking that the revelation he received was confined to the land of Judah, Jonah fled by sea in the hope of escaping his mission. Once more the Commandment instilled understanding in those without senses and excited the waters against the rational one who was attempting to maintain silence. The sea quivered with the Hint's arrows and Jonah's boat alone was disturbed.[53] The sailors were instructed by their teacher, the wind, and examined their deeds for iniquity in the crucible of lots. Against his will Jonah was forced to reveal his mission, proclaiming the one God over all to the peoples by way of the uncircumcised sailors.[54]

At his own request, Jonah was cast into the sea where he was ensnared and descended to Sheol as a living dead in a grave (the fish) within a grave (the sea).[55] It was not of his own doing that he fled nor was it in order that he die

---

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 353.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 355.
[50] Hom. 14, Mingana, I, p. 135.
[51] *Ibid.*
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 136.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 139.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

that he was buried in the fish. That of the future was being depicted in him as a great mystery. For through the death of one man God was going to undo death, make all live and release the world from slavery. Jonah served as a symbol prior to the realization of these things and as such was preserved without corruption. He was buried for three days so that he serve as the type of the hidden truth (ܪܘܫܡܐ ܠܟܣܝܘܬܐ ܠܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ) upon its being revealed. He paved a new way prior to the deeds so that once accomplished, they not be strange to those who would see them. All these prefigurations (ܦܠܐ̈ܬܐ) took place for the salvation of the peoples, that they not doubt the redemption of men by a man.[56] If this is not so, Narsai asks, why did Jonah need to be buried in a fish? Why was he not chastised by other means? And why was he sent to the Ninevites; for when were the prophets of the people ever sent to strangers? Nineveh is a mirror reflecting the spreading of redemption to the four corners of the earth.[57] There Jonah preached salvation to those long dead and revived them with the hope of a life of repentance. He rebuked the inhabitants and allowed them forty days for repentance. But it was not only perdition for the city made great by God which was announced, but compassion as well. The threats were meant to cause the haughty to descend from on high to humility[58] and to cut out the ulcer of iniquity spreading in the faculties of their souls.[59]

The iniquitous did indeed repent as foreseen by God before they came into being. It was His love which urged them towards knowledge of Him and repentance. Jonah was greatly displeased, for he saw in their repentance the revival of the nations at the end of time through the second Adam.[60] God instructed him to be merciful by means of a trial: a gourd grew up suddenly and then withered. The gourd was his teacher, the rational one a pupil of the irrational one, and it bound him in love to sinners against his will. If Jonah was pained by the destruction of a gourd should God not be pained by the destruction of rational beings created in His image?[61] Through one man God was going to turn all towards His faith and according to his type He called the Ninevites to heed Jonah's message. With the intent of saving the peoples God prolonged the course of prophecy, confining it first in the people and then causing it to go forth to the peoples through Jonah. All look towards the accomplishment of Jonah's mission, for God has shown them in Jonah the seemly image hidden in the symbol.[62]

---

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[57] *Ibid.*, p. 142.
[58] The parallels to the impudence of Adam and Eve as well as the builders of the tower of Babel are evident.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 145.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 146.
[61] *Ibid.*, p. 147-148.

5.6 Theodore's Typology

Both Theodore's typology and doctrine of the two ages have been described by various authors in differing contexts.[63] The forthcoming survey of his ideas will therefore be limited to that which is of specific interest in order to determine the relationship between Narsai's and Theodore's use of types and symbols in general and their interpretations of Ex. 25 and Nu. 21 in particular.

The first and foremost application of the term "image" in Theodore's work is to man on the basis of Gen. 1,26. Man, he says, "was given something of the ability to create, which is one of the abilities of the Creator of the universe, of which he has an imitation albeit far removed from the Divine".[64] This is because what is true of images in general is valid for man as well, i.e. they are far less than those of which they are images because the latter are alive whereas images are seen in simple form.[65] Theodore's discussion of the proximity of the symbol to the symbolized is most clearly expressed in his commentary on the minor prophets.[66] The introduction to Jonah is a useful starting point for it is there that Theodore lists various things or events which he regards as types as well as the reason he sees them as such.[67] God, he says, announced Christ's coming in advance in various things and places so that the Jews would know about the second condition. At the same time, God is said to have shown His providence to the Jews precisely because of Christ, whose lineage was transmitted through them. It is in Christ that the promises made to Abraham and to David would be realized (τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια). In view of this, that which God did in the past was of value for those who lived at the time but contained a hint of that which would happen later as well. However, that which was to come is far superior to the former events. Under Christ, for example, the peoples would truly be blessed (the promise to Abraham) and the kingdom established eternally (the promise to David). The relation between earlier and later events is that of a type to the antitype, meaning that a certain resemblance or – better – a certain imitation (μίμησις, as said of image above) must exist. Not only does the type point to the antitype, the latter, when occurring in reality, shows how inferior the former is in comparison. Two examples, both relevant to our study of Narsai, are provided by Theodore: the exodus from Egypt and the brazen serpent. The first was of value to the Israelites who, by means of the blood of the lamb, were redeemed from slavery in Egypt. But these are types of a greater redemption from death and sin effectuated by Christ by means of His own blood. Then resurrection, immortality and release from sin will take place, not in the promised land, but in the kingdom of heaven. The brazen serpent (like the events in the desert described in 1 Cor. 10,11) is an instance of Divine instruction occurring in types whereby men learn to fear sin.[68] After the Israelites were bitten by the snakes, God commanded Moses to make a brazen serpent so that by looking at it, those bitten be released from suffering. It was not that God couldn't have healed them directly or by other means. It was precisely through the likeness (ἀπεικονίσματα) of that which caused harm that they were relieved, "so that we not be amazed that we will be released from death by the death of Christ". Citing Jo. 3,14-15, Theodore supports his arguments from Christ's own comparison between Himself and the serpent. He concludes that He who gave healing through the snake is the same as He who provided release from death, not only for Christ but for all men.

A lengthier discussion of the serpent is offered in Theodore's commentary on Jo. 3,13-15:[69] "That which Christ told about His ascension was considered far from credible and because He was going to submit Himself to the passions of the cross, He added: 'Just as Moses raised up the serpent in the desert, so the son of man is going to be raised up'. This was meant to remove doubt about that which was said. For just as the forcewhich commanded Moses to make the snake relieved those who looked at the snake, so too He who will suffer the passions of the cross will make those who believe in Him worthy of eternal life on account of the force dwelling in Him. Just as the lifeless snake accomplished this through the force of another, so the mortal, through the force which dwells in him, prepares life for those who believe in him".[70] The elements of the arguments in both the commentaries on Jonah and on John correspond with Narsai's in Hom. VI: the exact choice of one thing and no other; God's wish to remove doubt in advance; the lifelessness of the snake and Christ's mortality; the healing by a look and faith effectuated by the same force in the serpent and in Christ. In the commentary on John it is especially Christ's humanity which is stressed and this too is reflected in Hom. VI.

---

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 148-149.

[63] Cf. e.g. Devreesse, *Essai*; Bultmann, *Exegese Theodor*, esp. p.99-110; Wickert, *Pauluskomm.*, p. 157-171; Norris, *Manhood*, p. 160-173; Zaharopoulos, *Theodore*, p. 103-175, Guinot, "Typologie".

[64] Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 13,n.4). Cf. Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 14,n.3) where man's functioning as an image is said to remain far behind the reality of the archetype yet the imitation suffices to enable man to conduct himself according to insight. Cf. Petit, "L'homme", no. III-IX, p. 276-281.

[65] Theodore (Nau, *Controverse*, p. 659). Here Theodore mentions images of bronze (ܢܚܫܐ) or on canvas or the like.

[66] Theodore (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*)

[67] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 169f).

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 170. Instruction of this sort need not occur in types. Cf. Theodore (Tonneau, p. 55,3-11) where expulsion from Paradise is said to have made Adam and Eve aware of what they lost and caused them to hate sin.

[69] Theodore (Vosté, *Comm. Ioh.*, p. 71-73).

The snake and the exodus have served Theodore as illustrations prior to his detailed explanation of the story of Jonah. The events surrounding Jonah's mission were so unusual, he says, that they must be seen as purposeful. These are Jonah's refusal to be sent to Nineveh, the greatness of his punishment, the test at sea and his being swallowed and then vomited up by a fish. Clearly God had other methods available to punish Jonah and urge him on[71] and so we must consider Jonah a type of Christ. Here too the type was a guarantee, so that men doubt neither Christ's resurrection after three days nor the salvation of the peoples through Him.[72] Beyond this, Jonah comforts the prophets who despaired after failing to convince Israel to turn from its evil ways. For through Christ all the peoples, like the Ninevites, would turn to the good, except for the Jews who had felt distress when the Ninevites repented. Jonah's flight represented the feelings of his people, both he and they fearing that the special position accorded the Jews would be usurped.[73] While the Ninevites' return foretold the return of the nations, it remained only an indication of that which would happen. For despite their repentance, the Ninevites themselves were later punished according to the prophecy of Nahum, for attacking Israel.[74]

By situating the story of the Ninevites within its historical context, Theodore indicates where the limits of typological comparison lie. These he delineates more precisely in his commentary on Micah 4,1–3.[75] Rightly, says

---

[70] This argument is part of a larger discussion of Jo. 3,13 ("No one ever went up to heaven except the one who came down from heaven, the Son of Man" ...) where Theodore explains that suffering may be attributed to the Son of God, even though God is impassible, on account of the unity with the human being.

[71] Theodore (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*, p. 172). Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 173) compares the methods God used here with those He employed for Moses and Jeremiah.

[72] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 172).

[73] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 173).

[74] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 176).

Theodore, is the verse "the torah will go forth from Zion" attributed to the situation of the Jews after their return from the Babylonian exile. It is crazy to say that it also applies to Christ. This is because the type must imitate that which it typifies, which is clearly not the case here, in as much as God's service will take place everywhere according to the words of Christ (Jo. 4,21.24). Theodore's discussion of Za. 9,9 is slightly different in that he concedes that the words apply to Christ but insists that they refer firstly to Zerubbabel. The scriptures, he warns, may not be divided into texts applying to historical figures and texts applying to Christ. However, certain words are spoken in hyperbolic fashion, meaning that they were not the whole truth but a shadow. "For the law contains but a shadow" (Heb. 10,1) which Christ brought to an end in all things, showing the truth which then shows the truth of such expressions (which is less). Thus we are no longer dealing with individual types but with whole nature of the law, which is a shadow of all things pertaining to Christ. This once more, finds its parallel in Narsai but in abbreviated form. In Hom. 2 "On the Revelations", the prophetic texts which he applies to Christ are limited and follow Theodore's choice without reiterating the use of hyperbole.[76] Theodore's arguments are presented even more succinctly by Narsai in Hom. VI, st. 353-360, where our author simply says that were it not for Christ, the snake would have been nothing at all, because the law is but a shadow pointing wholly to Christ.

But what of the tabernacle? There are three remaining fragments relevant to Ex. 25.[77] The first involves a rather confusing use of terminology. Whereas Pesh. twice uses the term ܕܡܘܬܐ (Ex. 25,9.40) or "likeness" for that according to which Moses was to make everything, LXX employs two different terms, παράδειγμα (Ex. 25,9) and τύπος (Ex. 25,40). To complicate matters further Paul (Heb. 8,5) first calls the sanctuary a ὑπόδειγμα and σκία of the heavenly sanctuary and proceeds to quote Ex. 25,40 where "type" is used. Combining these various terms, Theodore makes a distinction between the tabernacle which was a ὑπόδειγμα, and the furnishings which are ὁμοίωμα. The first is more than a resemblance, for it is said to be an imitation (μίμημα), which the furnishings are not. The sanctuary was a copy of the universe and was needed so that "all would know that the Lord of the universe dwelled among the Israelites and all which took place through His Economy would be considered great and worthy of Him". Here too the copy, like types, removes doubt about that which was effectuated. Additionally, the notion that men come to know and honor God through His creation[78] applies here in that men learn about the creation of the worlds in two fashionings through the tabernacle. The model was thus depicted as if real while the furnishings were shown to Moses's spirit in a prophetic vision.

---

[75] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 197).

[76] See ch. 2.4 above.

[77] Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.1 and 2 and p. 27,n.1 [=PG 66,648 AB]). Devreesse is uncertain whether these fragments belong to a commentary on Exodus or Hebrews, a problem not immediate to the discussion at hand.

The description of the furnishings of the inner and outer tabernacle which follows[79] is close to Narsai's. The table with the bread is a symbol of the year made up of four seasons, the elements of which lead to the harvest of all things for the sustenance of life. The candelabrum was the symbol of the day completed by God and its lights, the seven days of the week. In the inner tabernacle was the ark, a symbol of the worship of God. The tablets of the covenant and Aaron's staff were signs that God's service is fulfilled by adhering to the law and the ministry of the cult. The urn of manna was a memorial of God's feeding of the Israelites in the desert when instructing them. The golden jar of incense[80] was the symbol of God's pleasure in proper conduct. The cherubim are the invisible powers[81] in whose midst God abides and who fulfill on His behalf that which is useful for us.

Here the fragments end, without having explicated how the tabernacle was a model of the world. Fortunately, Theodore's catechetical homilies provide much of the desired information. There[82] the two tabernacles which Moses made according to a Divine vision are the likenesses (ܕܕܡܘ̈ܬܐ) of the way of life on earth in which we now live and of the place above the visible heaven where Christ ascended, having been assumed on behalf of man's salvation. He was called a high priest because he did what high priests do: He approached God and others then approached through Him. But this is yet to take place, not having been realized. The high priest of the law entered the Holy of Holies but once a year so that there was no participation in heavenly things. So too mortals are unable to enter heaven, but Christ serves as a guarantee (ܥܪܒܐ) of their

---

[78] Cf. Theodore (Sachau, p. 2-3).

[79] Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 26,n.2).

[80] This is not included in Narsai's homily.

[81] Cf. Theodore's similar explanation of the cherubim in his commentary on Gen. 3,24 (Tonneau, p. 56,24-57,6 and Petit, *Coislin.*, no. 125).

[82] Theodore (Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p. 326-328, fol. 82v,5-83r,13). Cf. Staab, *Pauluskomm.*, p. 207,10-16 for the tabernacle as a symbol of heaven.

heavenly ascent.

The law is again said to contain but a shadow, providing an obscure prefiguration (ܒܗܘܪܐܝܬ ... ܦܠܐܬܐ) of the way of life in heaven by means of the tabernacle. A shadow, Theodore explains, is not the portrait (ܓܘܫܡܐ) of the things (cf. Heb. 10,1) because it only indicates the presence of a body but doesn't depict it. A portrait has a more exact likeness (ܚܬܝܬܘܬܗ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ) so that one recognizes what it represents. If the law then is but a shadow, what of the present life of Christians? It is only after resurrection that men will truly be reborn and enter the kingdom of heaven. There they will live as angels (Mt. 22,29–30) in a godly mode of life which is resplendent, delicate and pleasant.[83] Having become immortal, incorruptible and immutable, they will participate in filial adoption. Yet until that time when they will receive renewal in reality (ܒܢ ܒܘ̈ܬܐ), they have been given participation in the things to come – of which Christ is a guarantee – by means of types and signs (ܛܘܦ̈ܣܐ ܘܐܬܘ̈ܬܐ). These are provided in the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist by which men fulfill the signs of that which took place in Christ, associating themselves thereby with Him. The key word is *hope*, for through all these things hope is confirmed.

Baptism commemorates Christ's death as well as rebirth and is a type of the second birth which will take place at the resurrection. Here too Theodore says that the types are worthy of being believed because of the "excellence of that which will take place".[84] Yet the type of baptism differs from other types in that Christ was not only first in the reality of the resurrection but in the type as well, having allowed Himself to be baptized by John.[85] Thus it is clearly not the water in which the greatness of the signs is located; it is the activity of the Spirit which accomplishes rebirth. This calls to mind Theodore's remarks on Jo. 3,13–15. It was not the snake or the mortal who accomplished healing but the Force working through both.

Along with baptism, the sacrament of the Eucharist is also a type. The former, by means of hope, is a type of future birth of which the participant receives a pledge in the present life. The Eucharist represents the nourishment needed here,[86] giving sustenance from the grace of the Holy Spirit until symbols and types will cease. The bread and wine represent Christ's passion and provide hope of the lasting life and immortality to come. Yet Christ said not "this is the type of my body" but "this is my body". For it is not the nature of the bread nor even the nature of the body of Christ which posseses or gives immortality. The Holy Spirit gave it immortality so that by resurrection Christ received union with the Divine nature. Clearly Theodore would have preferred the use of type in the Eucharist formulation. Its absence, however, has led him once more to provide an explanation similar to that of Jo. 3,13–15.

---

[83] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 392–394, fol. 99r,22–99v,24–26).

[84] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 412, fol. 104r,22–24).

[85] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 448, fol. 113r,8–17).

Apart from representing the passion, the Eucharist is an offer and manifestation or portrait of the heavenly ministry. The priest in the church is like Christ, the high priest, who served in the true tabernacle (Heb. 8,1–2). Christ calls all to a new covenant and it is in hope that salvation is received, in anticipation that men await departure from the body and by faith that men subsist until they go to heaven where they will not longer see in a mirror or an enigma but face to face.[87]

The vision of Isaiah is related to the Eucharist by Theodore in a fashion parallel to Narsai's Hom. 38.[88] Those who partake of the Eucharist imitate the seraphs' sanctification (Is. 6), reciting "holy, holy, holy". Isaiah, by means of a spiritual operation (ܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ), was informed of the good things to come and of the great, heavenly ministry.[89] The sanctification revealed the Trinity, making known the one Lord in three persons (ܩܢ̈ܘܡܝܢ):[90] the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Isaiah was bereaved and said "I am a man", meaning one filled with sin. Yet at the same time he realized the greatness of God's grace by which remission of sins takes place. The coal he saw on the altar represents the sacrament, for just as the coal was cold but glowed when put in the fire, so the bread and wine are transformed to body and blood by the Spirit. In the same way in which the seraph approached Isaiah and purified the prophet's sins, so debts are removed by the sacrament. Not even the seraph

---

[86] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 472, fol. 119r,7–10). Types according to Theodore, must be suited to present life.

[87] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 492, fol. 124r,10–26).

[88] Theodore (*ibid.*, Hom. XVI, p. 530–604, fol. 133v–152r).

[89] Theodore (*ibid.*, p. 542, fol. 136v,18–22).

[90] Narsai uses the term ܩܢܘܡܐ (hypostases), reserving prosopon for the union of the Divine and human natures. This union is also called prosopon by Theodore. Although the latter explains that it is not correct to speak of a hypostasis without its prosopon (Norris, *Manhood*, p. 228–233, esp. p. 229), by Narsai's time the use of the one term to express both the members of the Trinity and the union of natures was felt to be confusing.

dared to touch the coal, making use of the tongs as an intermediary. The priest, however, uses his own hand to present the sacrament. If the coal held by a tongs touched lips and wiped away sins yet neither burned nor was consumed, how much the more, concludes Theodore, should one receive the gift from the priest in confidence and hope.

5.7 From Theodore to Narsai

Theodore's typology may be considered a well developed tripartite system. Types not only express the relationship between the Old and the New Testament, but between the church and the kingdom of heaven as well. In this sense the priest in the tabernacle is a type of Christ, the high priest who entered the true sanctuary, while the priest of the church, endowed with the grace of the Spirit, provides a type of those things to come through the sacraments. Although this division in three has been used to describe the typology of many of the church fathers,[91] the historical value attributed to Old Testament types is nowhere as great as in the works of Theodore.[92] This is because his progressive typology corresponds to his concept of man's progressive maturity in this world. This includes man's having been created mortal at the start so that he learn to use his discernment by experience. Types are but part of this experience, familiarizing him with the future by means of analogous events. The relationship between the covenant at Sinai and the new covenant is continuous, the first having prepared the way for the second.

Narsai has proven once more to be an avid pupil of Theodore. Although he rarely uses the term type, it is clear from the homilies dealt with in this chapter that the objects, events or words which function typologically are limited in number and parallel to those in the works of Theodore. Should one object that the homilies available are but a small part of Narsai's original oeuvre and thus not representative, one needs only to consult Hom. 2 ("On the Revelations") to be convinced of their representative nature. The criteria used by Narsai and Theodore to establish types are much the same. Types are limited to those things considered as such in the New Testament, although even some of these are considered as no more than illustrations. The events of the past must imitate future events closely. It is the cumulative correspondence which convinces, together with a certain oddness of events. Thus the fact that the snake and nothing else expiated calls for further inquiry. Types are meant to remove doubt about God's predetermined plans, the truth of future events and especially Christ's humanity.

---

[91] Cf., e.g. Beck, "Symbolum", p. 33 and Murray, "Theory", p. 8 with regard to Ephrem. The three parts are said to parallel shadow, image and reality.

[92] None of the East-Syrians reproduce his reasoning at length and most, while adhering to his basic principle, are willing to admit more (messianic) types or messianic prophecies than he. See the next section.

5.8 The East-Syrian Exegetes on the Tabernacle and the Serpent

5.8.a Cyrus of Edessa

Of special interest to us in this study of typology is the link Cyrus makes between the gold plate, the serpent and the lamb of the exodus in his "Explanation of the Resurrection".[93] Should one ask how it is possible for a man to procure redemption for angels and men, writes Cyrus, one may draw proof from the plate (ܛܣܐ), the serpent (ܚܘܝܐ) the lamb (ܐܡܪܐ) and so on. [94] How these three offer proof remains unclarified. We might provide the argument from Narsai's Hom. V and VI: If these inanimate ones were able to bring about expiation, healing and redemption and men believed in their effectiveness, how much the more should they believe that these would be procured for men by a man, a rational being. That Cyrus only hints at these things implies that the covering, snake and lamb were already common elements in the demonstrations on Christ's humanity.

It would also appear that by the sixth century a set list of biblical verses was drawn upon for proof of the revelation of the Trinity, if only by images, in the Old Testament. In Cyrus's "Explanation of the Ascension"[95] these verses are none other than Gen. 1,26,[96] Gen. 11,7 and Is. 6,3 which are introduced in the discussion of Dt. 6,4. Concerning Dt. 6,4 Cyrus says that it not only prevented men from worshipping sticks and stones but introduced that which was going to occur in Christ so that it not be considered strange. Here once more is a parallel to Theodore's definition of the type as being useful at the time it occurs, yet pointing to the future reality which is superior.

Further on in the "Explanation of the Resurrection" cited above, insight into Cyrus's typology is provided. Types and parables are set within the context of the Divine Economy: God had determined from the start that He would make

---

[93] Cyrus, p. 106,5-9.

[94] The last two have rightly been identified by Macomber as the brazen serpent of Nu. 21,6-9 and the lamb of Ex. 12 (Cyrus, transl., p. 92,n.4 and 5). The plate, however, is surely the covering of the ark (Ex. 25) and not the plate tied to Aron's mitre (*ibid.*,n.3).

[95] Cyrus, p. 147,6-148,9.

[96] Cited as "Let us make man" and not, as in Narsai's homilies, as "Come, let us...".

manifest the coming world while men should first live in this world in order to be educated and progress. Like Theodore and Narsai, Cyrus too states that it is only through comparison that men understand the greatness of that which is to come. This comparison takes place between this world and the next, but also between types and Christ, the true exemplar. The types indicate that no new thought occurred to God and prevent disbelief when the truth is realized. The types listed are the sprinkling of the blood of the dumb lamb, and the brazen serpent in the wilderness which effectuated deliverance from death. These two examples, followed by the comparison of the blood of bulls with the blood of Christ, are found in almost identical fashion in Theodore's introduction to his commentary on Jonah. That this is indeed Cyrus's source is confirmed by the next paragraph which compares Jonah's stay in the fish for three days with Christ's having remained in the earth for three days.[97] The former will prevent the Jews from disputing about a man having been buried yet rising up after three days to immortality. Conversely, Christ rose after three days because He needed to fulfill the type, "disposed in Jonah for guidance and direction ...", which is but a shadow of the body who is Christ. The argument that the reality needs to fulfill the type seems to be a simplification of Theodore's arguments that the unusual events surrounding Jonah occurred because God wanted him to serve as a type of Christ and that these events make Jonah an incontestable guarantee for Christ while Christ makes clear that Jonah is a type.[98]

The treatment of the tabernacle as the "semblance (ܕܘܡܝܐ) and shadow of the dwelling place in heaven"[99] follows the typology of the two tabernacles found in Theodore's catechetical homilies, as Macomber has already pointed out.[100] Here too, it will be recalled, the entrance of the priest at all times into the outer tabernacle is contrasted with the high priest's entrance but once a year into the inner tabernacle. The former represents the place on earth, the later the dwelling place above to which Christ, the true high priest, has entered.

---

[97] Cyrus, p. 111,15-28.

[98] Theodore (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*, p. 170). Theodore's argument (Tonneau-Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, fol. 82r,22-82v,2) that one recognizes he who is represented in a portrait if familiar with him, may apply here. For if one knows Christ, he may recognize Jonah as His image.

[99] Here the description is clearly based on the Syriac version of Heb. 8,5 where ܕܡܘܬܐ and ܛܠܠܝܬܐ are used for ὑπόδειγμα and σκία.

[100] Cyrus, transl., p. 40,n.6.

5.8.b Cosmas Indicopleustes

Wolska, in her study of Cosmas's *Christian Topography*,[101] points to the following hierarchy of themes: 1) Divine Economy in general; 2) the two conditions with the two spaces of the tabernacle and the universe and 3) the geography which is in accordance therewith. One would therefore expect an extensive treatment of the tabernacle and the way in which it serves as a symbol or type of the universe. Although this theme recurs frequently,[102] it is almost always treated in the same manner. The tabernacle, writes Cosmas, is the type (τύπος) and copy (ὑπογραφή) of the entire universe. Constructed by Moses according to Divine revelation, the outer tabernacle is a type of the visible world and the inner tabernacle the type of the future world or heavenly abode. The veil dividing the tabernacle in two represents the firmament which divides the world in two states. As a type of this world, the outer tabernacle contains, as Paul says (Heb. 9,1–5), the table in the north with twelve breads as a type of the earth bearing fruits of all sorts. These stand for the twelve months of the year and are placed in four groups of three, representing the seasons. The candelabrum is a figure of the luminaries bearing seven lamps according to the seven days of the week which in turn make up the months and the years. The candelabrum was located in the south and cast its light on the bread as the sun's rays shine upon the fruits of the earth. Thus far, Cosmas's and Narsai's descriptions are very close. New is the addition by Cosmas of the cornices around the table as representations of the ocean and the earth on the other side of the ocean where Paradise is located. Here Cosmas's literal parallelism between the tabernacle and geography, unattested in the works of other authors, becomes apparent. As for the inner tabernacle, its access but once a year to the high priest foreshadows Christ's entrance once and for all into heaven, "the true tabernacle not made by the hands of man" (Heb. 8,1–2). He entered "not with the blood of goats or bulls but with his own blood" (Heb. 9,11–12). How the ark of testimony or the cherubim represent things of the future remains unsaid. In general, the law, says Cosmas, "is but a shadow of things to come" (Heb. 10,1) and more specifically, the inner tabernacle is a prefiguration of Christ's ascension according to the flesh and the entrance of the just (Heb. 10,19–22). For Christ was an instrument of propitiation (Rom. 3,25) and this is why the

---

[101] Wolska, *Topographie chrêtienne*, p. 45.

[102] The main passages are Cosmas, II, 35-36 (Wolska, I, p. 342-343); III, 16,51-53,55 (Wolska, I, p. 321, 361-363, 365-367); V, 20-44, 64, 112 (Wolska, II, p. 39-75, 99, 169–171); VII, 10-11, 71, 82, 86–87 (Woslka, III, p. 67–69, 133, 145, 149–155).

propitiatory was placed in the inner tabernacle.

Wolska contrasts Theodore and Cosmas on the subject of the tabernacle, claiming that the former sees the objects in the sanctuary purely as symbols, whereas Cosmas derives the geography of the world from the same.[103] While it is true that Cosmas links the objects of the outer sanctuary with the physical world, he hardly does so more than Theodore[104], aside from the portrayal of the table. Moreover, his description of the inner tabernacle is much vaguer. Cosmas establishes the same links as does Narsai to Rom. 3,25 and Heb. 8-10. He limits his typological comparison to calling the propitiatory the type of Lord Christ according to the flesh, yet refrains from emphasizing the humanity of Christ as a prerequistie for the salvation which He effectuates. The lack of detail makes it unclear whether Cosmas has been influenced by Theodore only or by the East-Syrian exegetes.

As for the brazen serpent, Cosmas compares Moses's activities to Christ's.[105] The exodus from Egypt, the crossing of the sea, the sojourn in the wilderness, the giving of the law and the brazen serpent foreshadow Easter, baptism, the church, the gift of the Spirit and the cross. These same events are cited by Theodore in his introduction to Jonah.[106] Once more, the absence of an extensive typology for the serpent may be part of Cosmas's conscious avoidance of specifically Nestorian christology.

5.8.c Theodore bar Koni

The questions posed by Theodore bar Koni most relevant to our study are numbers 16 and 31 of Mēmrā III and 1 and 16 of Mēmrā IV. The first question[107] concerns the reason for the fashioning of the tabernacle. Once more the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia is felt, for it is said that by means of the tabernacle God taught us about the two worlds. New here, as one would expect in a compilation, is that two explanations are sometimes provided for the same object. The ark, for example, is the symbol of either the divinity or the divinity and the humanity. The expiation above it is the symbol of Christ's humanity. This is unlike Narsai, for whom the plate symbolized both the body and the force dwelling in it: mortality and the Word. Whereas Aaron's staff commemorated the election of the priests in the past according to Narsai, and God's ministry by the priests attending to the cult according to Theodore, for Theodore bar Koni it is a prefiguration (ܦܠܐܬܐ) to Mary's conception without seed or watering. One wonders whether Theodore would have found such symbolism acceptable. Theodore bar Koni adds that for "them" (probably meaning the Israelites) it meant that they refrain from contesting the priesthood. As for the shewbread, he says that they were arranged either in two rows of six or four rows of three, symbolizing either the two or four seasons into which the year was divided. Narsai speaks of two rows of six and the change of seasons in general while Theodore simply mentions the yearly cycle of four seasons. Are Theodore bar Koni's options reflections of a difference felt to exist between Theodore and Narsai?[108] In any case it is clear while the doctrine of the two conditions is the starting point for Theodore, Narsai and Theodore bar Koni, there are differences in detail, although perhaps not as many as one would expect after three centuries.

---

[103] Wolska, *Topographie chrêtienne*, p. 44.

[104] See above, 5.6.

[105] Cosmas, V, 111-112 (Wolska, II, p. 167-171).

[106] Theodore (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*, p. 170).

[107] Theod. b. Koni, p. 154,19–156,6.

The brazen serpent which Moses hung up (ܙܩܦ)[109] is the symbol of our Savior's cross, says Theodore bar Koni. He then cites Jo. 3,14–15 and adds that it was neither the nature of the snake nor men which healed but the force which operated in both. The Jews later worshipped the serpent, despite the fact that it could not have healed by its own nature. The last remark, although not paralleled in Theodore's extant works, could very well be derived from him, in view of his penchant for historical observations. The name ܚܘܝܐ is said to have been designated the serpent, not on account of its nature but because of those who killed. This might accord with Theodore's commentary on Gen. 3,15[110] where he explains that the enmity between men and serpents is not perpetual – for men fear snakes on one occasion and disregard them at other times – while that between men and Satan is enduring. The section closes by comparing those who looked at the snake and were saved from death and those who look at the cross and are freed from demons. The wonder is that in one case relief came through wood and here by the cross. This passage is surely derived from a source other than the rest of the passages of this section because it once more offers a parallel between the serpent and Christ, this time emphasizing the cross

---

[108] In the three extant fragments relevant to Ex. 25, Theodore does not mention the number of rows. There is no biblical support for a distribution of four rows of three.

[109] Theodore and Narsai use the terms derived from the root ܪܘܡ (raised up) and from ܙܩܦ which is normally associated with the cross or crucified one.

[110] Theodore (Tonneau, p. 48,7-9).

without any trace of the discussion of Christ's humanity or the union of the two natures.

The vision of Isaiah[111] is the symbol of the Trinity which the Divine Economy was going to proclaim but first depicted in the prophets so that when it be revealed men not contest. Earlier hints were provided in Gen. 1,26, Gen. 11,7, Dt. 6,4 etc... Here again is our standard list of proof texts.

The scholion on Jonah[112] is very close to Theodore's commentary. Jonah, beyond all prophets, shows in deeds, not words, that which would come about through the Divine Economy. The Ninevites' repentance serves as a rebuke for the Jews and a comfort for the prophets. The fact that Jonah remained in the fish for three days and was punished by no other means shows clearly that he is a symbol. That a symbol is not the reality is attested to by the facts that shortly after their conversion, the Ninevites warred against Israel and God. The new features here concern the dating of Jonah's mission and the location where he was vomited up by the fish. Theodore bar Koni also presents a difference of opinion as to whether or not Jonah indicated that the Ninevites would be saved if they repented. He thinks not, for the Ninevites would otherwise not have said, "Who knows whether God will not have pity on us" (Jon. 3,9). Yet there are others who believe the opposite. Although Theodore bar Koni mentions no names, among these are none other than Theodore and Narsai. Jacob of Sarug says that Jonah added not one word more than commanded by God.

5.8.d Išo'dad of Merv

Išo'dad opens his section on Ex. 25[113] with the purpose of the fashioning of the tabernacle. God was determined to make two worlds and commanded Moses to make the type of the two so that when things were realized, men not say that a new thought occurred to God. The reasoning here is similar to that offered by Cyrus[114] and Theodore in his introduction to Jonah concerning the need for types and enigmas in general. Like Narsai, Išo'dad mentions the curtain which divided the tabernacle in two like the firmament. The ark, he says, is the divinity and the covering the humanity which is expiation while the book of the law is Divine knowledge. Here we find a combination of ideas from Theodore and Narsai.[115] As for the cherubim, these are either the forces who serve the Shekhina or the angels who accompany Christ. The first explanation is found in Theodore[116] and the second in Narsai.[117] Two arrangements of the bread are suggested: two rows of six or four rows of three. The bread is also compared here for the first time with Christ and is said to be the type of the living bread on the sixth day at Golgotha. Here, as elsewhere in Išo'dad's commentary, types other than those found in Narsai or Theodore are admitted.[118] The expansive discussion of the objects which follows reflects none of the works treated thus far. One passage of interest to our study of Narsai and the question of the tradition of the school, however, is that on Ex. 28,15.[119] Three things are called expiation, says Išo'dad: the plate on the ark, the judgment plate and the expiation of sins mediated by them. Both plates are called expiation on account of their activities (i.e. as opposed to their nature).

---

[111] Theod. b. Koni, p. 261,11–263,21.

[112] Theod. b. Koni, p. 282,6–284,15.

[113] Išo'dad, II, p. 46,23–48,29.

[114] Cyrus, p. 109–110. See above, 5.8.a.

Išo'dad's explanation of Nu. 21,9,[120] is wholly other than what we have seen thus far, apart from a brief remark parallel to the one found in Theodore bar Koni yet placed in a new context. Išo'dad presents a list of reasons why the snake was brazen and not made of any other material. To the fourth reason - "lest, had it been made of gold they'd consider the wonder as pertaining to it and not to God's power" - is added that this is indeed what occurred.[121] Also new is the reproach against those who say that the serpent was a symbol of Satan and not of Christ. But how can the symbol of Satan offer healing, Išo'dad asks. The snake is the symbol of Christ's crucifixion and not of His very essence (ܩܢܘܡܗ) and so the problem is resolved. Narsai's treatment of this problem is perhaps reflected in his calling the snake the symbol of Christ which not only refers to the latter's humanity but rebukes the demons as well who made use of this very form.

Išo'dad's commentary on Is. 6[122] is largely an expanded version of Theodore bar Koni. In both, the use of rhetorical questions as in Narsai's homilies, is absent (e.g. "if a coal could purify, how could the Eucharist not purify"; or "how

---

115 See above, ch. 4.11, for the combination he makes between Theodore (or the author of the commentary published by Jansma) and Narsai.
116 Theodore (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 27,n.1).
117 Homily V, st. 233-234.
118 Cf. Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, IV, transl., intro. p. I-VII.
119 Išo'dad, II, p. 50,5-11.
120 Išo'dad, II, p. 102,27-103,15.
121 Theod. b. Koni, p. 167,24-168,3.
122 Išodad, IV, p. 9,12-11,13.

much the more does the Eucharist purify").[123]

Many of the ideas found in Theodore's commentary to Jonah are found in Išo'dad:[124] the events which took place in the story of Jonah are the end of all types in the law and the type of those things which will be accomplished in Christ. All nations will come to fear God by means of the instruction of Him who will remain in the grave and of whom Jonah is the type. Jonah's mission makes known the audacity of the Jews, who persecute their own prophets and will be rejected. Jonah fled to avoid predicting the conversion of the peoples and the rejection of the Jews, which he understood to be the true purpose of his mission. He fled, not because he didn't know that God was omniscient, but because he thought that prophecy was only in the promised land. He fled because he was afraid of being seen as an impostor, preaching the downfall of a city which would be saved in mercy. The latter, while derived from Theodore's commentary, is part of a larger discussion as to whether or not Jonah announced salvation through repentance along with threats of destruction.[125] Išo'dad states explicitly that the Interpreter is among those who think Jonah did do so. He makes no special mention of Narsai, who follows Theodore, or of Jacob of Sarug who is of the same opinion as Išo'dad. Theodore is also referred to concerning the place where Jonah emerged from the fish. Išo'dad agrees that Jonah was swallowed up and released in the same spot.

Aside from the remarks attributed by Išo'dad to Ephrem, there is mention of a triple grave: under the mountains, in the sea and in the fish. Whereas Narsai speaks of a grave within a grave (the fish in the sea), the tradition of a triple grave is found in Jacob of Sarug's homily on Jonah.[126]

5.8.e The Anonymous Commentary (AC)

The AC[127] follows Išo'dad closely on Ex. 25 supplemented by passages from

---

123 One would be inclined to attribute this absence to the difference in literary genres. Theod. b. Koni does, however, make use of this rhetorical style elsewhere.
124 Išo'dad, IV, p. 92-99. The parallels in Theodore and Theod. b. Koni have been indicated by Van den Eynde in the texts and notes of the translation (Išodad, IV, transl., p. 118-126).
125 Cf. Theod. b. Koni, p. 283,21-284,6.
126 See below, 5.10.b.
127 This section is based on unpublished passages in the anonymous commentary (AC) of ms. Mingana Syriac 553 which has kindly been made available to me by the editors of CSCO. AC has been dated most recently by Van Rompay, Diyarb., transl., intro., p. XLIV, to sometime between 850 and 950, shortly after the completion of Išo'dad's commentary. Many of its passages are derived from Diyarb. and others from Išo'dad. For a discussion of the dating and nature of the commentary, cf. Van Rompay, *ibid.*,

Theodore bar Koni and it is unnecessary to review these here. One detail found in neither yet paralleled in Narsai concerns the candelabrum. The name is given to the stand in the middle (from which the six arms branch out) and the extra branch is the seventh day.[128] According to Narsai (Hom. V, st. 137–8) six branches were fixed on the candelabrum and it (the stand which is the candelabrum) was in the middle, like the days of the fashioning of the universe with the sabbath at the end.

The remarks made above concerning Ex. 25 are equally valid for Nu. 21,9[129] in which the ideas of Īšoʻdad and Theodore bar Koni are presented successively. There are two additions to these, the first of unidentified origin and the second resembling the opening of Narsai's Hom. VI. In the first passage[130] the serpent is said to have been hung on either a lance (ܪܘܡܚܐ) or a staff (ܚܘܛܪܐ), that it be seen by the entire camp. In the second[131] the anonymous commentator explains that the serpents were not brought upon the Israelites from another place, as was the locust and the cattle plague (Ex. 10,13; 9,6–7), rather they were there in front of them yet restrained by God from doing harm. Because the Israelites murmured, God no longer intervened and the serpents bit. The presence of this passage in the AC which is absent in both Theodore bar Koni and Īšoʻdad may indicate that the AC, like Īšoʻdad, drew independently upon older sources.

5.9 Ephrem's World – A Plethora of Symbols

At first sight a world of difference would seem to exist between Ephrem's *Commentary on Genesis and Exodus* on the one hand and his hymns on the other hand, as far as symbolism is concerned. The commentary is restrictive in its use of symbolism while the rest of Ephrem's works simply overflows with images and types. This has led Murray to characterize Ephrem in his exegetical prose work as "expounding Old Testament episodes as they occur, writing soberly as an exegete of the Antiochene type, with typology as currently used in that tradition". This he contrasts with the hymns where Ephrem "constantly interweaves biblical and 'natural' symbols".[132] I would beg to differ here,

---

p. XL–XLIV and the literature listed there.

[128] AC, Mingana Syriac 553, fol. 48v,27–49r,1.

[129] AC, *ibid.*, fol. 88r,18–88v,20.

[130] AC, *ibid.*, fol. 88v,13–15.

[131] AC, *ibid.*, fol. 88v,16–20.

[132] Murray, "Theory", p. 5. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 26, also considers Ephrem as a "representative of the θεωρία of the Antiochean School of scriptural interpretation... as

preferring to view the distinction between the two categories of works as one of quantity rather than of method. While Christ is not seen everywhere in the commentary, there is no discernible reason for the selection of persons or events therein. Why, for example, does Ephrem hear the sound of John coming before the Lord (Mt. 3,12) in the footsteps which God caused to be heard when appearing before Adam?[133] Why is Noah's ark compared to the church[134] and the olive branch brought by the dove to the chrism in his hymns[135] yet not in the commentary while in the latter the rock which Jacob anointed is said to depict the symbol of Christ hidden in it as well as the symbol of the church to whom all vows and offerings of all peoples were going to come?[136] The impression that "there is scarcely anything in the world which cannot serve Ephrem as a symbol of Christ"[137] could be gained from the thirty odd occasions where symbolism is acknowledged in the commentary.[138] Ephrem is certainly far removed from Theodore whose methods we have discussed in 5.6 above. If Bou Mansour is right when saying that Ephrem uses the term "type" (ܛܘܦܣܐ) where "a model is more explicit than is the case for symbol (ܐܪܙܐ)"[139] then this would agree with Theodore's use of the two terms. However, for Theodore symbols are not to be discovered everywhere. Theodore's basic concern is with types, which are limited in number, the various elements of which are called symbols, depending on the exactness of the imitation of the symbolized by the symbol. As such a type contains symbols but their number too is restricted. That the tabernacle is an important type for Theodore, in that it reflects his doctrine of the two catastases, has been demonstrated. The brazen serpent also plays an important role, not only as a type of Christ in general, in that Christ compared himself to the serpent (Jo. 3,13–15),[140] but as a type of Christ's humanity. We will now consider the role these two biblical episodes play in Ephrem's works.

---

far as his strikingly symbolical exposition on the basis of a *sensus simplex* is concerned". Although Kronholm is correct when saying that Ephrem's commentary is not allegorical, Ephrem is closer to Eusebius of Emesa than to Theodore in his use of symbols.

[133] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 40,12–17).

[134] Beck, *Eccl.* LI,2f.

[135] Beck, *Virg.* IV,9; VII,5–9.

[136] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 89,9–17).

[137] Murray, "Theory", p. 8 with regard to the hymns.

[138] This number is based on my own computation and does not include Ephrem's so-called "spiritual interpretaion" of Jacob's blessings (Tonneau, p. 118,4–120,7).

[139] Bou Mansour, "Terminologie", p. 230–231.

[140] The tabernacle too is treated at length in the New Testament (Heb. 9–10) – a prerequisite for types – and it is Theodore's understanding of Paul which has colored his

5.9.a The Tabernacle

In the discussion of the expulsion from Paradise above, it has already been stated that for Narsai, who follows Theodore, Paradise is located on earth in the east.[141] This mortal dwelling place was delightful and adorned with trees and fruits. The expulsion moved the Adamites to the outskirts of Paradise and the distance of their dwelling place from there grew in the succeeding generations until the flood. While the flood was a punishment, it was at the same time a benefit for the people who were transferred to wider spaces. The final renewal of mankind would bring it not back to Paradise, but to the kingdom of heaven, the second dwelling place which God, in His Economy, had readied from the beginning.

For Ephrem, "Paradise represents both the primordial and eschatological states".[142] In both Ephrem's hymns and commentary, Paradise is described as being elevated. When Adam and Eve fell, they literally descended to the environs of Paradise from whence Cain and his offspring departed for even lower and less fruitful ground.[143] It is to Paradise that men will return after the resurrection, to the various levels according to their merit. This includes the location beyond the tree of knowledge which had served Adam and Eve as a boundary to the inner region of Paradise.[144] It is in his description of the tree of knowledge as a veil[145] that Ephrem introduces a comparison between the sanctuary/tabernacle and Paradise. Although the comparison between the two is clearly related to Rom. 8 and Heb. 9 (the earthly tabernacle and the heavenly sanctuary),[146] the association between Paradise, the cultic mountain – sanctuary/temple – and eschatological Zion had already been established.[147] The tree, says Ephrem, prevented Adam and Eve from seeing the glory of the inner tabernacle and the glory of his own state. Thus the tree pointed in two directions: upwards to the lofty heights and downwards to the lowliness of man which he himself had not as yet perceived. The consequences of eating the fruit are the same in the third Hymn on Paradise and the commentary. Adam realized what he had lost and saw his own lowliness. It was not the veil of the sanctuary which was removed but the veil from Adam and Eve's eyes. According to the commentary, Adam and Eve knew good in practice and evil in theory before the transgression. In the hymn, they were like those who knew health in practice and understood sickness without suffering it. Yet the situation was reversed by their attempt to gain immortality unrightfully in the manner in which Uzziah tried to appropriate the priesthood for himself.[148] The hymn closes with imagery of the tabernacle which was divided into two, the outer one with perpetual entrance and the inner tabernacle accessible but once a year. Adam could go no further than the outer sanctuary,[149] but he was barred even from there after his audacious behavior.[150] The imagery shifts to the high priest who cures the leprous, a metaphor for God and Adam. God granted Adam reentry through the thief to whom glory was restored by Christ. These very themes are repeated in Hymn XV,7–9. The high priest is said to enter the sanctuary, a type of Paradise, but it is only according to the commandment that he may enter and eat of the fruit which is a symbol of revelation. Adam and Uzziah entered without permission and both were struck. From the above it is clear that Ephrem emphasizes the "return" of Adam so that the end is the undoing of the beginning and the realization of that which could have been. Adam and Eve could have been as Gods, yet attempted unjustly to become so by usurpation. It is through Christ that they become that which was within reach from the start.[151] Thus the comparison with the tabernacle is not only spatial but equally concerns proper and improper conduct.

For Theodore and Narsai the tabernacle is also a symbol of the church. The latter is a realization of the Old Testament sanctuary yet a type of that which is to come, providing a taste of the heavenly state and sustenance through the church and the sacraments in which the force of the spirit is at work. It is the same force which empowers the priest to act as an intermediary. The correspondence between church and Paradise found in Ephrem has been

---

exegesis of Ex. 25.

[141] Gignoux, IV, 27–28: "God fashioned them (Adam and Eve) outside of Paradise and in the place of Eden He placed them, there where the stars rise." Theodore specifically mentions the east (Sachau, p. 31,1–3; 33,12–13; Petit, *Chaîne*, nos. 230–231) and the place where the sun rises (Devreesse, *Essai*, p. 16,n.4).

[142] Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 49.

[143] See above, ch. 4.5. Cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 68.

[144] Beck, *Parad.* III,3.

[145] *Ibid.*

[146] Cf. Kronholm, *Motifs*, p. 72.

[147] Cf. Anderson, "Cosmic Mountain", esp. p. 199f and Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 51–52.

[148] Beck, *Parad.* III,14.

[149] *Ibid.* III,16–17.

[150] *Ibid.* IV,1–2.

[151] Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, p. 72–74.

discussed both by Murray and Brock.[152] We have already provided illustration of the symbolization of Paradise by the sanctuary. It stands to reason that the sanctuary serve not only as a symbol of Paradise but of the church as well, the latter being one step closer to the kingdom. However, the relationship between the two is not established in any one of the Hymns on Paradise. In Hymn II, for example, the levels of Paradise parallel the levels in Noah's ark and on Mt. Sinai. The final stanza of the hymn[153] culminates with the depiction of the church by the types of Paradise which do not include the sanctuary. Yet in his commentary on Ex. 25[154] Ephrem states quite explicitly that the temporal tabernacle was called both temporal and likeness (ܕܡܘܬܐ) because God wanted to make known that it would pass in order to make way for the church, that which as a perfect exemplar remains eternally. Moreover, by calling the tabernacle a likeness, God wanted to make it esteemed by them because it was a likeness of the tabernacle in heaven. Here the hierarchy of tabernacle, church and heavenly tabernacle is established by the use of the terms likeness, perfect/eternal exemplar, and heavenly. One supposes that this explicit link is made implicitly by both the writer and the reader of the hymns. The sense of progression so carefully constructed by Theodore and Narsai is limited in Ephrem to these few lines. This is no surprise, in that one would expect to find the essential elements of the varying doctrines reflected in eschatological concepts. For the Antiochene school, according to which man in the end would be known, by grace – but never in truth[155] – as the son of God through filial adoption, the role of Christ as intermediary is extremely important and is represented by the priests of the Old Testament and the church. Moreover, man's limited knowledge of the world to come requires a more detailed description of the tabernacle and its furnishings. For Ephrem, man's return to Paradise, impossible without Christ's help, is a realization of that which he could have been and knew about. As such it is no wonder that in the hymns, the primordial Paradise occupies the place filled by the sanctuary in Theodore and Narsai's works. Thus different elements of the chain cultic mountain – tabernacle – church – end time have been selected by the authors. It is also possible that Ephrem avoids making any positive link between the temple cult

---

[152] Murray, *Symbols of Church*, *p.* 254–262; Brock, *Hymns on Paradise*, intro. to Hymn VI, p. 108.

[153] Beck, *Parad.* II,13.

[154] Ephrem (Tonneau, p. 152,8–15).

[155] According to Theodore, men can never truly become God, nor were they ever meant to do so. Cf. Theodore (Tonneau–Devreesse, *Hom. catéch.*, p 296–298, fol. 75r,7–75v).

of the Jews and the church.

5.9.b The Brazen Serpent

It is one of Ephrem's basic tenets that animals are neither evil nor impure by nature. How they are seen is determined by the use to which they are put by men.[156] In his twenty first hymn against heresies, Ephrem illustrates his point with several examples, among which the serpent recurs twice. The golden calf was constructed from pure and beautiful gold, yet it became impure on account of the impure ones. So too the snake of Eden would have been sound had evil ones not made use of it. When men and Satan acted wickedly, God warned them by bringing harm to animals. That animals are not impure, the serpent which healed in the desert and the ass which exposed Balaam attest. Moses's staff also swallowed serpents and it was surely not Satan which served to expel Satan. Quoting Jo. 3,14, Ephrem rebukes Bardaisan and Marcion, asking them how Christ could have portrayed Himself in Satan or used Him for His types and marks.[157] The image of the snake needs to be honored more than Moses,[158] for it is the image of the Lord. Moses himself, who fixed the snake, saw that it healed and he, like the righteous before him, waited to see Him who would heal the wound inflicted by the first serpent.[159] The snake serves not only as an image of the Lord who will heal the lasting wound, but as a warning as well against those who would investigate Christ. For by an appearance (ܚܙܬܐ) the snake served the people of Israel just as the first-born, of whom the snake was a symbol, would serve the peoples through faith. Investigation didn't heal but a look at its appearance alone healed. So too looking in faith at the Lord of the symbols will bring healing.[160] Similarly the blood on the doorpost, the manna, quail, column of light and the staff symbolize Christ and these were not scrutinized by the Jews – infamous deniers – but accepted.[161] Could this be the source of Narsai's predilection for the term ܚܙܬܐ and not ܕܡܘܬܐ or ܨܠܡܐ for the serpent? If so, he has removed it from the context of Ephrem's polemics against the rationalists and inserted it into contemporary polemics concerning Christ's humanity. Because the grounds of the debate had shifted for Narsai, it comes as no surprise that Ephrem's remarks on Jo. 3,14 are set aside. In his commentary on the Diatessaron[162] Ephrem compares the serpent of Gen. 3 with those in Nu. 21 and the latter to Christ: "Just as the serpent killed Adam in Paradise, so the snakes massacred Israel. Just as those who looked with the eyes of the body at the sign fixed by Moses on the cross have bodily healing, so those who look with the eyes of the soul at the body of Christ nailed to the cross and believe in Him will live. The brazen serpent was impassible by nature and shows that Christ who suffered on the cross is *immortal by nature*." The time had passed when Christ could simply be called immortal by nature without any further explanation of the communication of idiom.

---

[156] See the discussion of free will in ch. 3 above. Cf. Theodore, Theod. b. Koni and Išo'dad (5.8 above) on the name ܚܪܡܢܐ given to the biting serpents.

[157] Beck, *CH.* XXI,11.

[158] Reminiscent of Narsai, Hom. V, st. 205–216.

[159] Beck, *Nat.* I,28.

[160] Beck, *HdF* IX,11.

[161] *Ibid.*,12.

5.9.c Jonah

Our survey of Ephrem's symbolism will conclude with Jonah as depicted in the Sermon on Nineveh and Jonah[163] and in the Hymns on Virginity.[164] The central themes are those of repentance, the rebuke of the circumcised by the uncircumcised and Jonah vis-à-vis other types. In the sermon, Jonah is sent to the Ninevites to warn them of the pending disaster. He does not tell them, however, that if they repent their sentence will be commuted because men must seek help themselves when in distress. Jonah was already aware that the Hebrews would be tested by means of the heathens for in the past a heathen priest had accepted Moses, a heathen widow received Elisha and David was aided when he fled. In Nineveh Jonah saw how the uncircumcised repented and hated his own people who remained obstinate. The Ninevites wished to accompany Jonah on his journey home so that they could admire the great people which had produced such a great prophet. Jonah put them off, saying it was a holiday in which only the people could take part. They followed him nevertheless and from a hill top saw how the Israelites had built altars on high places and worshipped a serpent. Clearly they considered their name and election as sons of Abraham more important than the proper way of life. The Ninevites thanked God who shamed the people through the peoples.

Jonah is said in the sermon, to have been ashamed of his people. In the hymns, Jonah is portrayed more negatively, as one who was sent against his will. He is compared to a sailor who expected to sink his ship, having received

---

[162] Ephrem (Leloir, *Diatessaron*, XVI §15, p. 290).
[163] Beck, *Sermones* II. Ie Rede über Nineve.
[164] Beck, *Virg.* XLII-L.

mercy himself yet forgetting mercy.[165] Both Joshua and Moses rebuked the circumcised. Jonah did the same but was greatly irritated by this. Yet he, despite his resistance, was the most triumphant.[166] Jonah was lesser than Abraham or Isaac but was the greatest type because he achieved the most.

5.10 Jacob of Sarug's Omnipresent Christ

5.10.a The Brazen Serpent

Three of Jacob's available homilies allow for a direct comparison between his typology and Narsai's. These are the homily "On the Brazen Serpent", the homily "On Jonah" and that "On the Symbols, Types and Figures of Christ".[167] The homily on the serpent opens not with a historical setting, as does Narsai's Hom. VI, but with a typological setting. Christ, says Jacob, was depicted on the entirety of Moses's way. With the staff, Moses took the Son from His Father on Sinai and they were joined and the staff became a shadow of the body. The staff raised fear in Egypt, did wonders on the sea and in the desert and bore His likeness.[168] Christ was noted in the brazen serpent as well and His symbol was set up against the poison of the serpents. He was placed everywhere the Israelites encamped so that they dwelled in the shadow without fear.[169] Here Jacob ends his introduction and turns to the behavior of the Israelites in Nu. 21. They ate manna - food of the angels - drank water from the rock, were relieved by the cloud (cf. 1 Cor. 10) yet murmured against God instead of proffering thanks.[170] Because they rejected the sweet food and were bitter, they were chastised by bitter ones who shed poison. The snake which, in Moses's staff, had struck Leviathan (Pharaoh) and crushed its many heads now came to harm them.[171] For while the snake which eats dust (Gen. 3) ceased from treachery, the Hebrews who ate sweet manna were very treacherous. The snake was bitter in manner but the Hebrew was bitter in will - a viper more evil than the serpent.[172]

The people, oppressed, knew why they were punished and begged for relief. God commanded Moses to make a serpent and place it as a sign in the camp so that he who looked at it would live. The Crucified One showed His Force, and His symbol healed the people.[173] His sign revoked the legion of reptiles and His shadow neutralized the poison.[174] Moses made an analogy to the Son and the Lord explained it: "As Moses raised up the serpent in the desert for the people, so will I be raised up for the world to look at me (cf. Jo. 3,14). The snake bit Eve and demons harmed the world and so it is right that I be raised up."[175] Jacob calls upon those harmed by Satan to look at Christ who was raised up in order to heal them. Christ, he says, was raised up on Golgotha and mercy flows from Him to him who looks at Him.[176] The body of Christ was depicted in the snake and cures all harmed bodies. The snake resembled the snake in all things except for the venom and Christ resembles men in all ways except for sin. If the snake gives relief in His image, how much the more will the image of the Son cure those who look at Him.[177]

---

[165] Beck, *Virg.* XLVII,21-24.
[166] *Ibid.* XLIX,44.
[167] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, p. 49-67; IV, p. 368-490; and III, p. 305-321 respectively.
[168] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, I, p. 49.
[169] *Ibid.*, p. 50-51.
[170] *Ibid.*, p. 51-52.
[171] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[172] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

Jacob closes the homily with a word of advice. Do not be alarmed by the cross, he says. For the snake was ugly yet healed and the Crucified One proclaims death yet gives life. The snake is called snake, but is not necessarily a snake. One must look beyond outward appearances to things hidden, for Christ undoes the death of Adam.[178] In the Old Testament a cruel one (ܚܪܡܢܐ) was victorious and in the New Testament a crucified one triumphed. The riddle (ܐܘܚܕܬܐ) told by Moses was solved by Christ because the light of His cross revealed hidden things. His healing was there and here, there His symbol and here His very being in truth.[179]

Jacob and Narsai

Jacob, unlike Narsai, attributes the success of the serpent to the working of Christ. It is He who worked all wonders accomplished by Moses. Although both authors regard the snake as the shadow and Christ as the reality, for Jacob it is Christ working through the snake and for Narsai, the force of the Creator in it which enables it to bring about healing. Jacob avoids the entire discussion of the union of natures in Christ and this is most obvious in his quoting of Jo. 3,14. He does not say "So the Son of Man will be raised up" but "I will be raised up". This is surely no accident. He contends against the Jew and so does Narsai but the latter is even more opposed to the heretic who denies Christ's humanity. Further juxtaposition of the homilies indicates that while their structures are parallel, they diverge at precisely those points already noted in chapters 3 and 4 above. Narsai's introduction commences with Abraham in whom God's economy is transmitted. Jacob opens with the symbols of Christ. For Narsai, like Theodore, Christ was unknown to the earlier generations while for Jacob, like Ephrem it was Christ who brought all things about and to whom all looked. Both proceed to the Israelites' murmuring in ingratitude based on 1 Cor. 10, to which Narsai adds the sin of idolatry. Having been attacked by serpents, the people cried out whereupon God commanded Moses to fashion a serpent. The serpent, according to Jacob, was poisonless just as Christ was sinless. Narsai emphasizes its lifelessness which removes future doubt abouta mortal's being able to heal. The term ܚܝܬܐ has been adopted by both from Ephrem. Jacob admonishes men to look beyond the surface and Narsai compares the credibility of a mere appearance with that of a man, both of whom are empowered by God's force. The issue of Christ's humanity is skirted by Jacob, both in his quote of Jo. 3,14 and in his polemics. The snake of Paradise lurks behind the brazen serpent in both homilies. The exhortations with which the homilies conclude call for men to turn to Christ. If men ascribe the force to aid to the serpent, they should do so for Christ, says Narsai, for the force of the Creator cured here and there. The snake and death are ugly, says Jacob, but they represent life, for our Lord cured here and there.

5.10.b Jonah

Jacob's homily on Jonah follows the order of the biblical story. It opens first, as did the homily on the serpent, with the message Jacob wishes to convey: Jonah depicted the Son and his mission denoted the type of His passion.[180] The first event, Jonah's calling and flight, prove that Jonah is the figure (ܨܘܪܬܐ) of Christ, for he couldn't have thought that there is a place inaccessible to God. Jonah was sent to announce repentance and if he himself hadn't suffered, he wouldn't have fulfilled the type. By Jonah's flight all the symbols were served and this is why he was buried in the sea, at the bottom of the mountain, for three days. Had he been at fault, he wouldn't have received the prophecy and no one would admit he is a prophet. It was the Divine

---

173 *Ibid.*, p. 55.
174 *Ibid.*, p. 56.
175 *Ibid.*, p. 57.
176 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
177 *Ibid.*, p. 59.
178 *Ibid.*, p. 64-66.
179 *Ibid.*, p. 67.

180 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 369.

Economy which caused him to flee.[181]

Jonah boarded a boat and set out to sea. The sea was turbulent and may be compared to the world whose waves full of suffering, abuse and uproar never are quieted. The floods are like the jealousy of the crucifiers.[182] Mary was a boat for the sailor who came for the sake of the world. The storm at sea represents both Jonah's test and the abuse hurled at Mary on account of the Lord. But Christ's way, Jacob points out, was greater than the prophets just as the substantial being is greater than the shadow.[183]

Jonah, feeling pain, fell asleep in the boat. Or perhaps the symbol confined him in sleep, extolling the likeness of the Son and depicting the sleep which overcame Him at sea.[184] The sailors called to their gods and cast lots and justice pointed its finger at Jonah.[185] The sailors asked what his iniquity was.[186] Instead of answering directly, Jonah said that he was of the race of Abraham, of Moses who split the sea, of Joshua who divided the river and of the people who crossed the dry land.[187] Jonah spoke of his Lord, ruler of the sea, and asked the sailors to throw him overboard.[188] The sailors first called upon God and asked that his innocent blood not be held against them.[189] Jonah descended into the sea, depicting the Son, His being killed and descent into Sheol.[190] Jonah died while alive and was not corrupted, his descent resembling that of the Son of God. The sea became calm, just as the crucifiers were quieted although they had agitated against Christ more than the sea against Jonah.[191] The sailors questioned Jonah like Pilot did Christ who then washed his hands in innocence. Jonah's entire course depicts the image of the Son, otherwise he would neither have been preserved from harm or undergone passion. In all these the judgment, killing, crucifixion and death of Christ were depicted.[192]

The next major theme is that of the fish which swallowed Jonah, giving hope in a place without hope.[193] Jonah entered a new grave and the fish was

---

[181] *Ibid.*, p. 373-375.
[182] *Ibid.*, p. 379.
[183] *Ibid.*, p. 380.
[184] *Ibid.*, p. 387.
[185] *Ibid.*, p. 396-397.
[186] *Ibid.*, p. 398.
[187] *Ibid.*, p. 401.
[188] *Ibid.*, p. 404-405.
[189] *Ibid.*, p. 407.
[190] *Ibid.*, p. 413.
[191] *Ibid.*, p. 414.
[192] *Ibid.*, p. 415.
[193] *Ibid.*, p. 416.

like a bridal chamber. It was pregnant without intercourse, for the new babe entered through the mouth.[194] Jonah was preserved in the fish just as God preserves babes in the womb without air, and he gave life to a place without life.[195] The two dead ones – Christ and Jonah – gave life; Jonah to Nineveh and the Son of God to the whole earth.[196] Jonah prayed in the fish, "Out of the deep I called to the Lord" (Ps. 118),[197] which was a Holy of Holies in which no man had entered except one. It was a temple not built by hands (Heb. 9,11) but born in the waters. Aaron and Elijah entered the tabernacle at the top of the mountain, in the temple of Solomon but Jonah was in the fish.[198]

Jonah went to Nineveh which was the sign of the people to whom Jonah's sign was given for examination. The Lord interpreted it, saying: "Just as he was in the earth, so I will go down to Sheol" (cf. Mt. 12,40).[199] Jonah had heard the prophecies, "a virgin will give birth and she will call his name Emmanuel"[200] but Jonah was beyond all prophecies without speaking.[201] The prophets painted images like artists but Jonah was the image and the portrait. He enacted the passions so as not to repeat the words already spoken.[202]

Jonah hated to go to Nineveh, knowing that God would not wipe away the city but was offering delay.[203] He preached destruction without repentance, giving the city forty days before it would be set as a horrible example for others.[204] The city repented, having heard that the Lord who brought the flood, dispersed the peoples, divided tongues, sent fire upon Sodom and the sword against Egypt had sent Jonah.[205] Jonah went without signs and Nineveh loved him, unlike Zion who was outraged when the Lord did seemly things in her.[206] This is why Christ said Nineveh will prosecute the race which didn't accept Him (Mt. 12,41). The gates of judgment on high had been closed by wrath but were opened in grace; the commandment stopped the angels' sword from destruction.[207]

---

[194] *Ibid.*, p. 418. Cf. Ephrem (Beck, *Virg.* XLII,10-33) for an extensive comparison of birth by a woman, a fish and at Nineveh.
[195] *Ibid.*, p. 420.
[196] *Ibid.*, p. 423.
[197] *Ibid.*, p. 425. Narsai cites Ps. 116 as Jonah's prayer.
[198] *Ibid.*, p. 428.
[199] *Ibid.*, p. 432.
[200] Is. 7,14. Here an anthology of messianic prophecies follows.
[201] *Ibid.*, p. 433.
[202] *Ibid.*, p. 435-436.
[203] *Ibid.*, p. 438.
[204] *Ibid.*, p. 440-442.
[205] *Ibid.*, p. 447.
[206] *Ibid.*, p. 461-462.

Jonah was saddened and blamed God for His goodness for he could find no other complaint.[208] God tested Jonah with the gourd, showing that the prophet was a man who was hurt by pain.[209] "Should I not feel pain about the destruction of thousands?" God asked.[210] Jonah's sorrow served as a comparison for God's compassion and the gourd was equated with creation, showing that God too had mercy upon His works.[211]

Jacob and Narsai

As in the case of the serpent, Jacob opens with the depiction of types and Narsai with God's revelations which showed things in a way appropriate for the immature. Jonah is called a just man by Narsai, who like his people and the just of that time, went upon the path of the election of the people without understanding God's intentions for the peoples. He therefore fled so as not to include the peoples, thinking that God only revealed Himself in Judah. According to Jacob, Jonah fled in order to fill the types, knowing that God was omniscient and omnipresent. Narsai would certainly agree that the specific events surrounding Jonah's mission and flight point to Christ. However, it was not the fact that he fled and was punished which make Jonah a type, but the circumstances of his flight and the means of punishment. Once at sea, Jonah revealed the worship of God to the sailors. This he did unwillingly, Narsai adds, because he had fled in order not to preach to the peoples. Jacob sees the storm at sea not only as a prelude to Jonah's burial in the fish but as an wealth of symbols, e.g. tempestuous life, Mary bearing Christ. The totality of symbols points to Christ's passion. Narsai and Jacob meet once more in their description of Jonah's burial in a grave within a grave. Both call Jonah dead yet alive, uncorrupted and preserved by God as a babe in a womb. Here Jacob, inspired by Ephrem, develops the theme of birth and miraculous conception. Narsai reflects upon the wonder of a *man* giving life to all and releasing the world from slavery. Jonah, like the serpent and the gold plate, was meant to remove doubt when the redemption of the peoples would take place. Jonah, Narsai continues, prayed ("In my sadness I said there is no salvation" (Ps. 116)), the fish was struck with labor pains and released Jonah there where it had swallowed him. Jacob does not specify where Jonah was swallowed and where he was

---

[207] *Ibid.*, p. 474.

[208] *Ibid.*, p. 478–479.

[209] *Ibid.*, p. 484–485.

[210] *Ibid.*, p. 486–487.

[211] *Ibid.*, p. 489–490.

vomited up.

We have noted earlier[212] that there was disagreement as to whether or not Jonah included repentance in his message. Narsai and Jacob take opposite stands, Narsai siding with Theodore who says that the possibility of return was revealed. God, says Narsai, relinquished His wrath and taught the Ninevites to hate iniquity. This same combination of wrath (and justice) with Divine pedagogics was also to be found in the flood story. Jonah was pained, the bible tells, and our two authors explain that this was because he was afraid his prophecy would be considered false. Narsai adds that Jonah did not wish to see the impure peoples revived. Neither Narsai nor Jacob follow Ephrem who considered Jonah a lesser type as far as his character is concerned. Narsai prefers to judge him according to his own times and Jacob prefers to avoid the difficulty by ascribing Jonah's behavior in the first instance to the Divine Economy and ignoring certain of its aspects later. Thus Jonah asked for death in order to resemble Christ who had stood up against the evil ones while owning nothing in the world. It was by making the possessionless Jonah the owner of a gourd that God taught Jonah to love that which is His.

5.10.c Symbols, Types and Figures

Jacob's homily from which the title of this section is derived[213] presents an amassment of scriptural symbols pointing to Christ. These are presented not according to the order of the biblical books in which they are found but rather according to the author's own process of association. I will list only a few examples which should suffice to reflect the tenor of the homily. The shadow of the crucifixion made Moses successful both in the sign of the cross which he made above the sea (Ex. 14,16) and in the wood which he cast into the waters to sweeten them (Ex. 15,25). The high priest's death allowed all those who were in the cities of refuge to return home (Nu. 35,25) just as the symbol of the high priest on Golgotha caused all to return to Eden (Eph. 2,4). Jacob opened the well (Gen. 29,10) which is baptism and the stone which he rolled away was sin removed through the force of the Son in him. Moses wrote that a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife and the two will be one flesh (Gen. 2,24). Here Moses saw how the church and Christ would be one and looking at Christ, called Him man and looking at the church, called it wife. This is a device (ܦܘܪܣܐ) or one of the means (ܥܠ̈ܠ) which God used so as not to reveal His story openly. Isaiah proclaimed that "a virgin would give birth and call his name Emmanuel" (Is. 7,14). Zachariah called him a man (Zach. 3,2). It is said that he rode on an ass (Zach. 9,9) and would wash his garments in wine (Gen. 49,11). Abraham made a cross on the earth when considering the land God was causing him to inherit (Gen. 13,17) and Elijah stretched himself out on the dead child (1 K. 17,21) in the form of a cross. The rock of Daniel's prophecy (Dan. 2,34) is Christ who is customarily called the rock. Noah remained a virgin for five hundred years (Gen. 5,32). Enoch was translated (Gen. 5,24). Enosh called upon the Son as "Lord, our Lord" (Gen. 4,26 and Ps. 8). Abel's blood (Gen. 4,10) is the blood of His offering and the blows he suffered are His crucifixion. Adam's sleep gave a mother to the world (Gen. 2,21; 3,20) and Christ's death gave baptism which flowed from him (Jo. 19,34). The closed one (Adam's side) bore Eve and the closed one (the virgin Mary) bore the Son. Jacob concludes that foundations without a building are nothing and so the Old Testament doesn't show its beauty without the New.

---

[212] See above, 5.8.c for the discussion reported by Išo'dad.

[213] Bedjan, *Homiliae*, III, p. 305–320.

This homily is remarkable on account of two things. First its symbols are all traceable to Ephrem's commentary and hymns.[214] Secondly, Jacob seems to have purposely chosen many of the symbols or prophetic quotes specifically rejected by Theodore. In his *Treaty against the Allegorists*, for example, Theodore explains Paul's allegorical interpretation of Gen. 2,24 as expressed in Eph. 5,28-32. According to the author, the human marriage is the reality while the mystical tie between Christ and the church is the symbol.[215] In his commentary on the minor prophets Theodore will at most concede that certain things are said hyperbolically. This is certainly true of Zach. 9,9 which he says applies in the first instance to Zerubbabel.[216] So too the rock which accompanied Israel in the desert is not Christ but was to them "in the likeness of" Christ. "For just as believers drink the blood of Christ which is spiritually transformed, so they drank the water which the Spirit caused to flow from the rock".[217] For both Theodore and Narsai, Eve's creation from Adam's side is a demonstration of the engendering of the Son by the Father.[218] The crying out of Abel's blood refers solely to the resurrection of the dead.[219] One must conclude that Jacob is

---

[214] See for example the remarks on Jacob at the well above.

[215] Cf. Van Rompay, *Comm. Psalm.*, trans., pref.. p. XXXVII-XLI.

[216] Theodore (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*, p. 367).

[217] Išo'dad (Gibson, V, p. 34-35) ad. 1 Cor 10. Išo'dad quotes the Interpreter here who "speaks against the allegorists".

[218] See above, ch. 2.2.

[219] See ch. 2.4 and ch. 3.2 above.

reacting directly against Theodore's typology and Narsai's adaptation of it.

To summarize, Narsai's use of symbols and types matches Theodore's views on history and anthropology. Ephrem's terms could be used at times, but their theology differs on the most basic level. This is made clear by Jacob of Sarug who follows Ephrem more closely and illuminates the conflicts on this point.

Chapter Six
An Image with Many Reflections

6.1 Ephrem, Theodore and Narsai: Two Magnets of Unequal Attraction

Narsai has been celebrated as the "Harp of the Spirit"[1] and as the epithet suggests, it is firstly and foremostly as a poet that Narsai has made himself a lasting name. He is considered by some as the originator of the twelve syllable meter in which most of his surviving homilies have been written and this meter has subsequently become known as the "meter of Narsai". Aside from the dodecasyllabic meter, Narsai also employed the seven syllable meter which had already been used by his predecessor, Ephrem, perhaps the most famous bard of the Syrian tradition. The homilies of Narsai differ from Ephrem's hymns in many ways, most importantly in their exegetical and didactic nature. Some have gone so far as to classify Narsai's work as "forensic rhetoric in greco-roman style".[2] However, the use of techniques characteristic of semitic poetry such as grammatical, lexical, semantic and phonological parallelism is common to both Narsai and Ephrem. This would lead one, more appropriately, to consider Narsai as Ephrem's artistic heir at Edessa.

If Ephrem's poetry significantly influenced Narsai's style, it is the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia which bear the key to understanding Narsai's works. Narsai's elegy "On the Three Doctors",[3] Theodore, Diodore and Nestorius, is direct proof of our author's admiration, if not dependence upon Theodore. According to Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān, Theodore's works were in the process of being translated in Edessa during Narsai's years as a student.[4] Barḥadbšabbā ʿArbāyā quotes Narsai's opponents as saying "the interpreter is a heretic because he concurs with the ideas of Theodore and Nestorius".[5] Many works written in the course of this century have illuminated various aspects of Theodore's exegesis and theology. The increased interest in Narsai's works during the past twenty five years has led to an animated discussion as to the exact nature of the relationship between Narsai and Theodore. As seen in chapter two above,

---

[1] Cf. the Chronicle of Se'ert (Scher, *Histoire nestorienne*, p. 114).

[2] McVey, "Nestorian Doctors", p. 87-96 followed by Blum, "Bau vom Abschnitten", p. 308-321.

[3] Hom. 11, translated by Martin, "Les trois Docteurs".

[4] Scher, *Cause*, p. 382-383. See ch. 2.1 above.

[5] Nau, *Histoire*, p. 600.

Theodore's all-encompassing theory of the two catastases which entails man's original mortality, the role of Divine pedagogics in leading man to a higher state and the hope provided by the Divine Economy and realized in Christ, forms the framework of Narsai's thoughts. Narsai has therefore rightfully been seen as a faithful representative of Theodore's vision of the world who helped spread his master's work in the Syrian realm. This he did, not by translating Theodore's works,[6] but by incorporating his ideas into his homilies.

The question as to Ephrem's influence is raised anew. How distinctly does Ephrem's voice resonate in Narsai's homilies? Is it muffled so that it is almost indistinguishable, as Gignoux would have it, or is it so shrill as to jar our sensibilities, making us aware, like Jansma, of an internal conflict in Narsai's works? From the study of six of Narsai's biblical homilies, we may conclude that Ephrem's influence varies in degree and nature from one homily to the next. The threefold division of the manifestation of God's Economy in moral instruction, revelation (with emphasis on the historical context) and types has been shown to derive from Theodore. These themes are especially evident in the two soteriological and the two typological homilies of our study (i.e. Hom. I and III and V and VI respectively). Man's imperfection and despair are counterbalanced by the hope offered in various degrees and various images (Pesh. Heb. 1,1) throughout the course of time. Immortality was assured first through the translations of Enoch and Elijah and most perfectly through Christ's ascension. Similarly the recognition of God by all peoples through Christ was first indicated obscurely in Noah's blessings and more clearly in the election of Abraham. The tabernacle is none other than the symbol of the two conditions and the propitiatory in it a type of the humanity of Christ through whom men would truly receive forgiveness on account of his humanity. The correspondence between type and antitype, the notion that the type serves to prevent doubt concerning future events and the emphasis on Christ's humanity and the force working through Him are characteristic of Narsai's typology as attested not only in Hom. V and VI but in many other homilies as well. These very same characteristics have been recognized as forming the basic elements of Theodore's typology.[7]

---

[6] It is uncertain whether Narsai understood Greek. The extensive use Narsai makes of his teacher's work would point to early and great familiarity with the latter prior to the completion of the translation project.

The study of Hom. II "On the Flood" and Hom. III "On the Tower of Babel" alter our picture. The total destruction brought about by the flood can not simply be subsumed under the category of "seeming" punishment inflicted for pedagogical purposes and used as the means (ܥܠܬܐ) for other ends.[8] For if the iniquitous were wiped away, what were they to learn and what purpose other than punishment did this serve? The wickedness of the people was the primary cause of the flood, even if it did allow humanity to move from cramped quarters to wide open spaces.[9] Here the interplay of Divine Justice and Grace, a leitmotif of Ephrem's works, is introduced by Narsai. His presentation, however, does not seem troubled but flows quite smoothly from concepts identified with Ephrem to those typical of Theodore. One wonders if Narsai did not feel that he was simply supplementing the brief account of the drama with accepted tradition whereby justice becomes identified with threats or the "guise" of wrath and grace with the purpose to which the "means" led.

The comparison of the two contemporaries, Narsai and Jacob of Sarug, both of whom were nurtured in Edessa and wrote in the same genre,[10] has served to focus our gaze on the distance which has grown between Narsai and Ephrem. Firstly, Jacob's christology, unlike Narsai's, does not seem to be marked by the debates of the 5th c. and as such is a relic from an earlier period. Secondly, Jacob's typology is far closer to Ephrem's and he, like the latter in his hymns, sees abundant symbols of Christ throughout the bible. In this sense the Old Testament is truly in service of the New. Lastly, Jacob openly argues against Theodore's and Narsai's concepts of man's original mortality and expulsion as part of God's predetermined plans. Yet he makes use of the very notion of

---

[7] Van den Eynde, Išo'dad, II, transl., p. 62,n.4, has noted Išo'dad's repeated claim that the giving of types serves to confirm God's prescience. This is yet another way of saying that God does that which He does for man's succor and development. Cf. e.g. Išo'dad, p. 129,19-28 for the establishing of the order of slaves and freemen through Noah's blessings, p. 158,28-159,1 for the revelation of Christ's humanity in advance (to prevent doubt) in the visit of the three "men" to Abraham (Gen. 18) and p. 172,1-8 for the depiction of the two ways of life in Isaac and Ishmael.

[8] The importance of this theme for East-Syrian exegesis is reflected in Theod. b. Koni's scholion, p. 170,1-21, on why God accomplishes His Economy causally (ܥܠܬܐܝܬ ܡܫܠܡ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܗ).

[9] Diyarb., p. 53,15-27 (paralleled by Theod. b. Koni, p. 98,19-99,9 and Išo'dad, p. 110,16-26) attributes the flood firstly to the wickedness of that generation and then explains its "other, providential cause", i.e. the transfer of men to roomier areas. While God could have done this straight away, the author notes, He waited until men were mature enough to benefit by it. The similarity to Narsai's homily is remarkable.

[10] Jacob of Sarug has also been credited with the introduction of the twelve syllable meter.

"causal" fulfillment of the Economy in his homily "On the Tower of Babel" without qualms. Should we speak of a clash of cultures here as well? It would seem that the question of man's free will and moral potential is most pressing in the story of creation. It is there that Jacob defends Ephrem's position most explicitly while later combining the notions of justice and grace with "cause" and effect without problem. Thus while elements of the "traditions of Ephrem" and the "commentaries of Theodore" were adopted communally, some serving as themes for the one, were part of the intricate theological system of the other.

6.2 The Beginnings of the East-Syrian Tradition

We learn from both Barḥadbšabbās that Narsai was a well-qualified director of the school of Edessa who fulfilled his task with insight and organizational talents. Occupying the office of interpreter, Narsai was in a position to influence the development of the young minds of his students who would later serve as leaders and teachers. Narsai's works are said by Barḥadbšabbā of Ḥalwān[11] to include the "traditions of the school" or those traditions which were "transmitted orally from the beginning". These traditions are juxtaposed to those of Ephrem and the two seem to be of equal importance. Yet in view of the rare occasions upon which Narsai is quoted by later East-Syrian exegetes, his influence would appear to be limited. One might be tempted to assume that Narsai's homilies became unavailable shortly after his death. However, the direct references to Narsai's works in Išo'dad's commentary prove the contrary: they were apparently accessible for those who wished to consult them.

The relationship between Narsai's homilies and the works of East-Syrian exegetes of the next generation is difficult to establish. Narsai is closest in time to Cyrus of Edessa, a student of Mar Abā at Nisibis prior to the election of the latter as patriarch in 540.[12] Cyrus himself says that his Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts reflect the words addressed by the "saintly teachers, that is, the professors of the community of the holy School of Nisibis".[13] As such, Cyrus's works are like Narsai's in that they do not form commentaries but reflect the teachings and traditions of the school. From the works of Narsai and Cyrus we are able to discern which ideas of Theodore were most current in the schools and which most readily transmitted in other genres. It becomes clear when one studies the Explanations, that while Cyrus combines many elements dispersed throughout the works of Theodore and sets them in a new context[14] – a reflection of the lectures at the school – he also consulted Theodore's commentaries directly and integrates nearly whole passages from them in the explanations.[15]

---

[11] Scher, *Cause*, p. 382-383.

[12] Cf. Macomber, Cyrus, transl., intro., p. VII-XII.

[13] Cyrus, p. 45,22-24 (transl., p. 39,15-20).

At a greater geographical distance from Narsai is Cosmas Indicopleustes of Alexandria. Nevertheless, his books are often closer in style and thought to Narsai than Cyrus's explanations. Cosmas claims to be a student of Mar Abā who instructed him while visiting Egypt. But Wolska has shown that Cosmas too had direct access to Theodore's works, as did Johannes Philoponos, Theodore's opponent in Alexandria.[16] Cosmas, says Wolska, adheres to Theodore's general plan yet largely neglects his exegesis,[17] engrossed as he is with the concept of the two catastases. He thus reduces prophecy and types to "meager formulas" and his examples of God's solicitude are other than those provided by Theodore. It would thus "be in vain", says Wolska, "to search for literal correspondences between the two as far as Economy is concerned".[18] All this is to be understood as part of a process of simplification of Theodore's works which is evident in the works of Thomas of Edessa as well. In this process, Theodore's ideas were grouped and themes set in a framework and adopted to any subject.[19] Wolska concludes that Mar Abā is the man responsible for the popularization of Theodore's ideas. Macina enthusiastically concurred with Wolska's hypothesis but preferred to attribute the simplification of Theodore's work to Abraham of Bet Rabban, Abā's teacher at Nisibis.[20] He later assigned the same role to Narsai, having been impressed by Gignoux's arguments.[21]

It is remarkable that precisely those sections in Cosmas considered by Wolska to be a "meager formulation" of types and a "reduction of the prophets

---

[14] For example, the hints at the Trinity in the Old Testament noted partly in Theodore's Catechetical Homilies are listed one after the other by Cyrus, p. 146,23–148,9, in his Explanation of the Ascension.

[15] See, for example, Cyrus, p. 109,23–113,21 (Explanation of the Resurrection, IV, 3–6) which is almost wholly derived from Theodore's commentary on Jonah (Sprenger, *Comm. Proph.*, p. 169–172). Macomber (Cyrus, transl., intro., p. XII) thinks it possible that Cyrus was involved in the project for the translation of Theodore's work set up by Mar Abā.

[16] Wolska, *Topographie*, p. 52 and 60.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 50–51.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[20] Macina, "Homme à l'école de Dieu", part 1, p. 115–116.

[21] *Ibid.*, part 3, p. 47.

to a catalogue of the signs announcing Christ"[22] find their parallels in Narsai's homilies. These include the line of revelations through Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac and the prophets found in Hom. 2 which is partially developed in Hom. I–IV of this study. It is therefore surprising that in a recent study by Grillmeier, Cosmas is said to be "far removed from the Nestorianism of Narsai".[23] While Cosmas is indeed brief in his treatment of prophecy, concentrating instead on the tabernacle as *the* symbol of the two conditions, Narsai seems to be most interested in the workings of the Divine Economy in history yet both are clearly part of the same tradition.[24]

As opposed to Wolska and to Gignoux and Macina in Wolska's footsteps, I would conclude, with Van Rompay,[25] that no single simplified version of Theodore's work was ever considered authoritative and consulted as such. Rather, already in the works of Narsai one can identify the elements of a tradition attested equally in Cosmas, Cyrus and Thomas of Edessa alongside of more literal gleanings from Theodore's commentaries. We might be justified when considering Narsai as the first to formulate these traditions in writing and this in fact would be the "tradition of the School" referred to by Barḥadbšabbā.

6.3 Narsai and the Later East-Syrian Tradition

The later commentators of the 8th–9th c. such as Īšo‘ bar Nun, Theodore bar Koni, the author of Diyarbakır 22, Īšo‘dad and the author of the anonymous commentary provide a far more condensed version of the "traditions of the school" than that found in Narsai's homilies. Theodore bar Koni, Diyarbakır and Īšo‘dad also directly consulted the works of Theodore. As Van Rompay[26] and Jansma[27] have already noted, these works are mixed, in that they incorporate both the tradition and commentaries. If Narsai's opinions were absorbed in the lessons taught at the schools of Edessa, Nisibis and later elsewhere, then direct consultation of his work was probably felt to be unnecessary. Additionally, one must admit that the genre in which Narsai wrote probably deterred all but the most industrious scholars. That this was indeed the case can be demonstrated by those instances in which Narsai's opinions are cited under the name of "other doctors" or the "tradition of the school",[28] such as the view that fire and not the figure of a man descended on Cain and Abel's offerings.[29] Aside from one instance in Išoʿ bar Nun, Išoʿdad alone quotes Narsai literally and also adds his name to those of other, more contemporary authors whose opinions are cited in Diyarbakır or by Theodore bar Koni.[30] Beyond this, Išoʿdad also appropriates many of Narsai's turns of phrase without acknowledging his source. A comparative study of Išoʿdad and Narsai might therefore help solve the question of Išoʿdad's hithertoe unidentified sources.

---

[22] Wolska, *Topographie*, p. 50 and 85.

[23] Hainthaler, "Cosmas", p. 152. Cf. p. 157,n.37 where Hainthaler calls Cosmas's ideas that the creation was created in six days to teach the angels and that the creation of Eve taught Adam that God is his creator, "kuriose Beispiele der Paideia Gottes". Yet precisely these ideas are found in Narsai's homilies and are part of the East-Syrian exegetical tradition.

[24] Wolska, *Topographie*, p. 110, notes that although Cosmas's christology is nowhere clearly expressed, more than christology is involved. It is the vision of the destiny of the universe and man upon which Theodore and Cosmas agree. Narsai's christology clearly follows Theodore's and in that sense Cosmas is unlike Narsai.

[25] Van Rompay, "Quelques remarques", p. 41–42.

[26] Van Rompay, *art. cit.*, p. 42.

[27] Jansma, "Investigations", p. 82.

In conclusion, Narsai's homilies form a unique reflection and synthesis of Theodore's basic concepts in a genre closer to Ephrem than any greco-roman rhetorical style.[31] It is Narsai's poetry which "heightens the awareness of his message to its receivers"[32] yet discouraged later commentators from consulting his works. However, his legacy was passed down in the teachings of the school while his fame as a poet lived on.

---

[28] Cf. Diyarb., p. 11,22-25 where an opinion of Narsai's concerning the covering of the light at night by the angels is introduced with the words "some say" and opposed by the "common tradition". Thus although the earlier tradition voiced by Narsai is no longer the common tradition of the 8th c., it is not forgotten.

[29] Diyarb., p. 47,6-11.

[30] Cf. e.g. Išoʿdad, II, p. 76,17-20 and p. 100,27-101,1.

[31] The latter is a better description of the works of Cyrus and Thomas of Edessa than of Narsai's homilies.

[32] The working of poetry in this manner is described by Berlin, *Parallelism*, p. 140 and illustrated for Narsai in Frishman, "Enoch and Elijah", p. 291-297.

Samenvatting

De vele Wegen en Middelen van de goddelijke Economie
Een Editie, Vertaling en Studie van zes bijbelse Homilieën van Narsai

Dit proefschrift bevat een editie (Deel 1) en een geannoteerde Engelse vertaling (Deel 2) van zes tot dusver onuitgegeven metrische homilieën van de Syrische schrijver Narsai (gestorven in 502/503). Deel 3 bevat een studie van de inhoud van deze homilieën, waarbij gepoogd wordt, mede op grond van gegevens uit de rest van Narsai's œuvre, een aantal aspecten van de theologie van de auteur te reconstrueren en deze te plaatsen in de Oost-Syrische exegetische en theologische traditie. De geselecteerde homilieën, die tot twee verschillende metrische patronen behoren (2 x 12 lettergrepen en 4 x 7 lettergrepen), handelen alle over oudtestamentische onderwerpen: I. Over het wegnemen van Henoch en Elia; II. Over de zondvloed; III. Over de zegens waarmee Noah zijn zonen zegende; IV. Over de toren van Babel en de verdeling der talen; V. Over de oprichting van de tijdelijke tabernakel; VI. Over de koperen slang. Wanneer deze homilieën in onderling verband bestudeerd worden, blijken ze een goed inzicht te geven in enkele basisideeën van Narsai's theologie.

De editie in Deel 1 berust op alle (meestal in de vorm van microfilm) toegankelijke handschriften. Zoals ook voor andere werken uit de Oost-Syrische literatuur het geval is, zijn de meeste handschriften van Narsai's werken nauwelijks honderd jaar oud. Als basishandschrift is ms. Londen, British Library Oriental 5463 (gekopieerd in Urmia in 1893) gekozen, één van de twee handschriften die de zes homilieën bevatten. Voor ieder van de homilieën zijn in het kritisch apparaat de varianten weergegeven van een wisselend aantal handschriften. De betreffende handschriften worden bewaard in Teheran (ms. Neesan I, dat eveneens alle homilieën bevat), Leningrad - St. Petersburg (ms. Diettrich 5, dat homilieën I, II, V en VI bevat), Birmingham (ms. Mingana Syr. 55, dat dezelfde vier homilieën bevat), Londen (ms. British Library Oriental 9367, waarin de laatstgenoemde vier homilieën aanwezig zijn, en ms. British Library Oriental 9363c, dat homilie VI bevat), Vatikaanstad (ms. Syr. 594, dat homilieën I, II en VI bevat, en ms. Syr. 588, dat homilieën III en IV bevat). In de Turkse stad Mardin, tenslotte, wordt een oorspronkelijk uit Diyarbakır afkomstig handschrift bewaard (ms. olim Diyarbakır 71), dat voor deze editie

slechts de tekst van homilie VI biedt, maar verreweg de oudste tekstgetuige is (waarschijnlijk te dateren in de 14de eeuw). Drie andere voor deze editie relevante handschriften, die bewaard worden in Bagdad en Alqosh (Irak), waren niet toegankelijk.

Hoewel het beperkte aantal homilieën geen voldoende basis vormt voor een systematisch onderzoek van de onderlinge verhouding van de handschriften, kan in sommige gevallen, op grond van de genoteerde varianten, de verwantschap tussen de handschriften worden aangegeven.

De in Deel 2 gepresenteerde Engelse vertaling sluit zo nauw mogelijk aan bij de Syrische tekst van de homilieën. In het notenapparaat vindt men vooreerst een aantal gegevens die corresponderen met emendaties of varianten in het kritisch apparaat van Deel 1. De andere voetnoten hebben betrekking op de inhoud van homilieën. Behalve korte verklaringen, verwijzingen naar bijbelplaatsen en andere plaatsen in Narsai’s œuvre, worden vele verwijzingen gegeven naar parallelle passages in exegetische werken van de Antiocheense School en van de Syrische exegetische traditie. Van de Antiocheense School is voor deze studie Theodorus van Mopsuestia verreweg de belangrijkste auteur, aan wiens werken geregeld gerefereerd wordt, hetzij in het Griekse origineel, hetzij in de Syrische vertaling. Naast Theodorus is ook veel aandacht gegeven aan de bijbelkommentaren van andere Antiocheense exegeten, met name (in chronologische volgorde) Eusebius van Emesa (wiens Genesiscommentaar geciteerd wordt in de Armeense editie), Diodorus van Tarsus, Gennadius van Constantinopel en Theodoretus van Cyrus. Ook Cosmas Indicopleustes past in dit kader. Van de oorspronkelijk in het Syrisch gestelde werken wordt vooral Efrem de Syriër vaak in de voetnoten geciteerd. Behalve Narsai’s jongere tijdgenoot Cyrus van Edessa, is verder veel aandacht gegeven aan de latere (vooral 8ste- en 9de-eeuwse) theologische en exegetische verzamelwerken: het Scholiënboek van Theodorus bar Koni, de anonieme commentaar op Gen. - Ex. 9,32 van ms. Diyarbakır 22, het Vragenboek van Išo‘ bar Nun, de bijbelcommentaar van Išo‘dad van Merv, en de zogenaamde Anonieme Commentaar (die voor homilieën V en VI geciteerd wordt in ms. Birmingham, Mingana Syr. 553). Deze uitvoerige verwijzingen in de voetnoten zijn er niet alleen op gericht de tekst van Narsai’s homilieën te verduidelijken, ze dienen ook, in samenhang met de gegevens van Deel 3, als basis voor de studie van Narsai’s plaats in de Antiocheense en Syrische exegetische traditie.

Deel 3 opent met een hoofdstuk over het leven en het werk van Narsai (Hoofdstuk 1). Van fundamentele betekenis in de biografie van Narsai is het feit dat hij, afkomstig van ‘Ain Dulba in Noord-Mesopotamië (dat toen Perzisch gebied was), verbleven heeft aan de School van Edessa, eerst als leerling en later als leraar en schoolhoofd. Hoewel Narsai’s Edesseense tijd niet precies gesitueerd kan worden (in het tweede derde van de vijfde eeuw), behoorde hij tot de eerste generatie die kennis maakte met het werk van Theodorus van Mopsuestia, dat zeker vanaf het midden van de vijfde eeuw definitief ingang vond in de Syrische wereld. Theodorus (gestorven in 428) wordt beschouwd als de vertegenwoordiger *par excellence* van de Antiocheense school van exegese, waarbij de nadruk sterk ligt op een letterlijke en historische uitleg van de bijbel. De bijbel wordt opgevat als het verslag van de geschiedenis van Gods vooropgezette plan om de mensheid tot volwassenheid te brengen. Het Oude Testament vertelt van Gods omgang met het volk Israel, die uiteindelijk tot de komst van Christus zou leiden. Hoewel typologie wel een rol speelt in Theodorus’ exegese, worden verwijzingen naar Christus in het Oude Testament slechts erkend wanneer het Nieuwe Testament zelf daar expliciet over spreekt. Het gebruik van typologie als vorm van uitleg moest bovendien aan stricte criteria voldoen. Belangrijk in Theodorus’ theologie zijn het idee van de twee "catastases" of levenssituaties - de wereld van het tijdelijke en de toekomstige wereld in de hemel -, de opvatting dat de mens noodzakelijk een leertijd moet doormaken die hem voert tot volwassenheid, en de leer van de twee naturen in Christus, waarbij zonder Christus’ menselijkheid de verlossing niet mogelijk zou zijn.

Narsai’s gehechtheid aan Theodorus’ ideeën blijkt uit zijn biografie. Volop verwikkeld in de vijfde-eeuwse christologische discussies, moet hij Edessa verlaten, ergens tussen 470 en 489 (de datum waarop de School wordt gesloten) en opent vervolgens een nieuw centrum van geleerdheid in Nisibis (in het Perzische gebied), waar onder zijn leiding de leer van Theodorus het uitgangspunt wordt van het theologisch onderricht.

De algemene presentatie van Narsai’s opvattingen over Gods werking in de geschiedenis (de goddelijke "economie"), in Hoofdstuk 2, laat duidelijk Narsai’s afhankelijkheid van Theodorus zien. De relatie tussen Narsai en Theodorus is in de afgelopen decennia al vaker aan de orde geweest, met name in de studie die Gignoux, naar aanleiding van zijn editie en vertaling van de homilieën over de schepping in de jaren ’60, gewijd heeft aan de bronnen van Narsai’s denken. Hierop aansluitend echter heeft Jansma een discussie in gang gezet over Narsai’s bronnen, in het bijzonder voor de scheppingshomilieën. Gignoux had volgens

Jansma Theodorus terecht geïdentificeerd als een belangrijke bron, maar hij had geen aandacht besteed aan de rol die Efrems werk speelde. Jansma zag Narsai's homilieën als "een weerspiegeling van diens strijd met een dubbele loyaliteit ... en de wisselwerking van twee botsende culturen". Het is precies deze spanning die volgens Jansma Narsai's werk boeiend maakt.

In de loop van deze studie is voortdurend het werk van Narsai bekeken vanuit de vraagstelling naar de herkomst van zijn denken. Ieder van de hier uitgegeven en vertaalde homilieën heeft aanleiding gegeven tot een studie van Narsai's ideeën over het betreffende thema en de plaats ervan binnen zijn theologisch raamwerk. Daarbij zijn Narsai's gedachten, zoveel als mogelijk is, geconfronteerd met deze van Efrem en van Theodorus en voor zover het bewaarde materiaal het toeliet geplaatst in hun ruimere context.

De homilie over Henoch en Elia (Hom. I) is in hoofdstuk 3 behandeld en biedt de gelegenheid voor een terugblik op de schepping en de eerste zonde van de mens, aan wiens hopeloze toestand weer hoop wordt gegeven door de wegneming van Henoch (Gen. 5,24). Hier blijkt duidelijk dat de invloed van Theodorus op Narsai veel groter is dan die van Efrem. Net zoals Theodorus ziet ook Narsai de mens als sterfelijk geschapen, met als opgave door middel van de ervaring en zijn onderscheidingsvermogen te leren en daardoor enerzijds steeds verder tot volwassenheid te komen, hoewel hij anderzijds steeds meer naar de zonde neigt. In iedere generatie geeft God hem nieuwe hoop op onsterfelijkheid en een onverdorven leven in de tweede catastase, waarop het hele leerproces in de eerste catastase gericht is. Efrems opvattingen over deze kwesties zijn geheel anders. Volgens hem is de mens, ook al meteen na de schepping, volop in staat voor het goede te kiezen, temeer daar hij door God in alle mogelijke opzichten daartoe wordt geholpen. Des te teleurstellender is zijn falen. Efrem beoordeelt het voortdurende zondigen van de mens dan ook veel negatiever dan Theodorus, voor wie het leerproces zo belangrijk is. Indien de mens, ondanks zijn zondigheid, steeds nieuwe kansen krijgt, dan is dat volgens Efrem te danken aan de goddelijke Genade, die voortdurend de goddelijke Rechtvaardigheid ervan weerhoudt de mens te behandelen zoals hij verdient. Men zou kunnen zeggen dat de wisselwerking tussen de goddelijke Rechtvaardigheid en Genade het hoofdthema vormt van Efrems commentaar op Genesis en Exodus.

Narsai's positie ten opzichte van Efrem en Theodorus wordt nog duidelijker wanneer men enerzijds Jakob van Sarug en anderzijds de auteurs uit de Antiocheense en Oost-Syrische traditie in het onderzoek betrekt. Jakobs opvattingen over de oorspronkelijke toestand van de mens en de morele

vermogens van de mens staan heel dicht bij Efrem, terwijl de ideeën over de oorspronkelijke sterfelijkheid van de mens die gemeenschappelijk zijn aan Theodorus en Narsai, door Jakob worden geciteerd en met kracht van de hand gewezen. Zo blijkt duidelijk dat Narsai uitdrukkelijk Theodorus volgt, terwijl zijn tijdgenoot Jakob van Sarug, die ook enige tijd in de School van Edesssa heeft verbleven, zich met nadruk tegen deze ideeën kant en trouw blijft aan Efrem.

Toch is Efrems invloed niet geheel afwezig uit Narsai's werk. Hij is o.m. te vinden in de analogieën die Narsai maakt tussen de goddelijke Drieëenheid en de zon, haar straling en haar warmte. Ook op een aantal kleinere punten zijn overeenkomsten met Efrems exegese aanwijsbaar in de Narsai's homilieën, maar nooit gaan die zover dat een afwijking van Theodorus' *Weltanschauung* in het geding is.

In hoofdstuk 4 zijn drie homilieën bestudeerd die verband houden met de zondvloed en de daarop volgende gebeurtenissen (II, III en IV). Hier is Theodorus' idee prominent aanwezig dat bestraffingen zoals de zondvloed, de vervloeking van Ham en de verspreiding der volkeren, door God gebruikte middelen zijn ten behoeve van andere voorbeschikte doeleinden. Dat God de mens ook zonder een zondvloed rechtstreeks naar een betere plaats had kunnen overbrengen, en dat hij de mensen ook zonder verspreiding de hele aarde had kunnen laten bewonen, is duidelijk. Desalniettemen neemt Hij de gelegenheid te baat de mensheid te helpen en te instrueren. Toch ontbreken ook Efrems ideeën over genade en rechtvaardigheid niet geheel in deze drie homilieën. Geconfronteerd met het probleem van de alomvattende vernietiging tijdens de zondvloed, laat Narsai Efrem's ideeën speciaal in Homilie II aan bod komen.

In hoofdstuk 5 staat Genesis niet langer centraal maar een tweetal uiteenlopende onderwerpen: de tabernakel (Hom. V) en de koperen slang (VI). Toch tonen deze twee homilieën verwantschap omdat ze beide gaan over voorafschaduwing en typen. Het feit dat Theodorus een zeer ontwikkelde theorie over typen bezat, maakt deze homilieën in het bijzonder relevant voor een bestudering van zijn invloed op Narsai. Narsai volgt Theodorus wanneer hij de werkzaamheid van zowel het type (het verzoendeksel en de koperen slang) en de realiteit (Christus' kruisiging en de teweeggebrachte verzoening) aan Gods kracht toeschrijft. Terzelfdertijd is Christus' menszijn onontbeerlijk in het heilsproces.

De laatste vraag die behandeld is gaat over de "traditie van de School", die volgens de zesde-eeuwse schrijver Barḥadbšabbā in Narsai's homilieën is ingevoegd. Deze schooltraditie wordt door Barḥadbšabbā genoemd naast

Theodorus' commentaar en de "tradities van Efrem". Van alle drie zegt hij dat ze in Edessa geraadpleegd werden. De "traditie van de School", zoals die volgens Barḥadbšabbā in Narsai's geschriften aanwezig was, staat niet los van de "tradities van Efrem" en de commentaren van Theodorus. Binnen het denkkader van Theodorus werden elementen van Efrem geïntegreerd en aangevuld met eigen interpretaties. Deze synthese, waarvan Narsai een vroege - indien niet dé vroegste - vertegenwoordiger was, kon bij de latere exegeten eigen accenten krijgen. Tegelijkertijd nam de invloed van Theodorus, wiens werken in toenemende mate bestudeerd werden, toe. Niet alleen Narsai, ook Cosmas Indicopleustes en Cyrus van Edessa (beiden 6de eeuw) maken hun eigen synthese van Theodorus' ideeën. Evenals Narsai vereenvoudigt Cosmas Theodorus' werken en populariseert ze, terwijl Cyrus dichter bij de oorspronkelijke tekst blijft.

De studie van Oost-Syrische exegeten tussen de zevende en de negende eeuw, zoals de anonieme commentator van ms. (olim) Diyarbakır 22, Theodorus bar Koni, Išo' bar Nun en Išo'dad van Merv heeft vele parallellen met Narsai opgeleverd en verheldert zijn ideeën daar waar er geen tekst van Theodorus beschikbaar is. Noch de anonieme commentator, noch Theodorus bar Koni citeren Narsai met name. Toch zijn er verschillende interpretaties, toegeschreven aan latere leraren, aan de "tradities" of aan "anderen" (in tegenstelling tot de "traditie van de School") die van Narsai of zelfs van Theodorus afkomstig zijn. Soms voegt Išo'dad Narsai's naam toe aan dergelijke interpretaties. Eveneens kon aangetoond worden dat Išo'dad hele dichtregels of delen daarvan direct aan Narsai ontleende zonder zijn bron te vermelden.

Tenslotte heeft de vergelijking tussen Narsai, Išo'dad, de anonieme commentaar en een fragmentarisch overgeleverde Genesiscommentaar, door Jansma aan Theodorus toegeschreven, enkele interessante vragen doen rijzen ten aanzien van de vroegste vertaling van Theodorus' werk in Edessa.

Aldus is aangetoond dat Narsai's werk om velerlei redenen interessant is. Hoewel het omwille van de poëtische vorm mischien minder toegankelijk was in het latere schoolonderricht, leefden Narsai's ideeën voort in de "traditie van de School" en ging hij als "Harp van het Oosten" de geschiedenis in.

Curriculum Vitae

Judith Frishman was born on July 4, 1953 in New York City, New York. After obtaining her high school diploma from Ramaz High School (Yeshivat Ramaz), New York City, New York, in 1971, she continued on to college, studying first at Brandeis University (1971-1973) and then at University College London and Leo Baeck College (1974) where she majored both in chemistry and Jewish studies. She graduated from Barnard College, Columbia University in 1976, receiving an A.B. degree magna cum laude in religious studies with special honors for her thesis. In 1976 she married Edward van Voolen and moved to England with him where she was enrolled as an "overseas student" at the School of Oriental and African Studies. It was there that she began her study of Syriac and Akkadian which would be continued at the Rijksuniversiteit Leiden in 1978. After completing her "doctoraal examen" cum laude in semitic languages with a major in Aramaic in 1983, she was appointed as an academic assistant in 1984 for a period of four years. During that time she worked on her doctoral dissertation and taught classes in Syriac and Jewish studies. Since July 1990 she has been working as an "universitair docent" in the field of Jewish Aramaic in the Department of Hebrew, Aramaic and Ugaritic Languages and Cultures at the aforesaid university.

Aside from her academic pursuits, Judith Frishman is active in Jewish feminism and has published several articles on this subject. In 1986 she served as a guest curator of the exhibit "«Sing to the Eternal One a New Song». The Changing Role of Women in Judaism" held at the Jewish Historical Museum, Amsterdam. She is a member of two Jewish-Christian feminist groups and a deputy member of the Dutch Council of Christians and Jews on behalf of the Liberal Jewish Community.

She has been involved in the Dutch branch of the Israeli peace movement Peace Now, serving as treasurer from 1983-1988. She continues to serve as a boardmember of the Liberal Jewish Teachers Training and Adult Education Program where she has been responsible for the planning of courses on such subjects as halakhah, modern Jewish literature and Jewish ethics over a period of ten years.